arXiv:1702.00868v2 [math-ph] 13 Apr 2017

Higher lattices, discrete two-dimensional holonomy and topological phases in (3+1) D with higher gauge symmetry.

Alex Bullivant[1,2], Marcos Calçada[2,3], Zoltán Kádár[2], João Faria Martins[2], and Paul Martin[2]

[1]School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom
[2]Department of Pure Mathematics, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom
[3]Departamento de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade Estadual de Ponta Grossa, Ponta Grossa, PR, Brazil

April 14, 2017

Abstract

We show that a proposed construction for higher lattice gauge theory is well-defined, including in particular a Hamiltonian for topological phases in 3+1 dimensions. Our construction builds upon the Kitaev quantum double model replacing the finite gauge connection with a finite 2-group connection. Our Hamiltonian higher lattice gauge theory is defined on spatial manifolds of arbitrary dimension presented by (regular) CW-decompositions. We prove that the ground-state degeneracy of Hamiltonian higher lattice gauge theory is a topological invariant of manifolds. Furthermore we determine the spectrum of the Hamiltonian for higher gauge theory in the 3-sphere in two important illustrative cases.

1 Introduction

In the absence of external symmetries, a topological phase of matter is characterised by a local, gapped, quantum many-body Hamiltonian whose effective (infra-red) field theory is described by a topological quantum field theory (TQFT) [Fra91, NSS$^+$08, WW16, Wan10] and therefore is diffeomorphism invariant. Consequently, topological phases of matter are insensitive to local perturbations in the sense that the amplitudes of physical processes are global topological invariants. It is this latter property which makes topological phases of matter a promising candidate for the implementation of fault tolerant quantum computing [Wan10, Pac12, Kit03, NSS$^+$08].

Due to a lack of local observables, experimentally distinguishing different topological phases can be a difficult task from a microscopic point of view. Instead the characterising properties of topological phases are most efficiently described by their emergent behaviours. Signatures for the presence of topological order include ground state degeneracies which depend on the spatial topology of the material in question [WN90, Kap14], universal negative corrections to the entanglement entropy [KP06, HIZ05, LW06] and the presence of stable topological excitations which provide non-trivial representations of their respective motion groups [KW14, KMRW16], ie. braid group for point particles (anyons) in 2+1D [NSS$^+$08] and the loop braid group in 3+1D [WW12].

In 2+1D there exist a plethora of well established frameworks for the mathematical construction of non-trivial TQFTs; see for instance [Tur94]. Path-integral models for such theories arise from Chern-Simons-Witten theory [Wit89] and from BF theory [Bae96], while the discrete realisation of BF-theory coincides with the Turaev-Viro [Tur94]/Barrett-Westbury [BW96] state-sum; see [Bae00]. In contrast, the 3+1D case is still lacking in a suitably general framework to capture all the intricacies of 4D topology. Nevertheless we have the Crane-Yetter TQFT [CY93, Tur94] and its generalisations [WW16, Cui16], and the Yetter homotopy 2-type TQFT [Yet93, Por99, FMP07]. The latter is derived from a strict finite 2-group [BL04], a higher – i.e. categorified – notion of a group, well known to be equivalent to a crossed module [BHS11, BM06]. These 3+1D TQFTs give rise to topological invariants which at most depend on the homotopy 2-type, signature and spin-structure of space-time [Tur94, FMP07], or are conjectured to do so. Promising approaches for

non-trivial 4D TQFTs rely upon the concept of a categorical representation of a Lie 2-group [BBFW12, BM06, Elg07], as explained for instance in [BF15]. From the path-integral point of view, 4D BFGC-theory [GPP08, FMM11], the higher gauge theory analogue of BF-theory, is expected to play a similar role to BF theory in 3D in what concerns to defining 4D invariants.

One fruitful approach to understanding candidate models for topological phases has been to define Hamiltonian realisations of TQFT's. In 2+1D, this approach has been successfully applied to the case of Dijkgraaf-Witten topological gauge theories [DW90, Kit03, HWW13, WWH15] and to the Turaev-Viro TQFT, giving rise to the so called string-net models [LW05]. In 3+1D this was applied to the Crane-Yetter TQFT [WW12, vKS13] and to Yetter's homotopy 2-type TQFT [WW16, BCK$^+$16] giving rise to a generalisation of string-nets to 3+1D. The celebrated Kitaev quantum-double model [Kit03] can be seen as a Hamiltonian realisation for the Dijkgraaf-Witten TQFT [DW90] with trivial cocycle and thus also for finite-group BF-theory.

Completing the programme initiated in [BCK$^+$16], in this paper we define an exactly solvable (the sum of mutually commuting projectors) Hamiltonian model for higher lattice gauge theory for manifolds of any dimension, generalising Kitaev's quantum-double model [Kit03] for topological gauge theories. We also prove that the ground-state degeneracy of the model is a topological invariant, closely related to Yetter homotopy 2-type TQFT, thus conjecturally related to finite 2-group BFCG theory. Our model utilises ideas from higher lattice gauge theory [Pfe03], and similarly to [Kit03], takes lattice gauge theory as the starting point (with its good connection to physical observation [Wil74, Kog79]) and mathematically lifts the structure through the process of categorification, replacing the gauge group with a gauge 2-group. We thereby enrich the local variables of lattice gauge theory (holonomies along edges) to include non-abelian holonomies along surfaces, which feature prominently in higher gauge theory [BS07, FP11, BH11].

The model constructed in this paper extends and formalises the proposal of [BCK$^+$16] for a Hamiltonian model for the Yetter homotopy 2-type TQFT [Yet93], from triangulated manifolds to regular cell decompositions (here called 2-lattices). The fact we use 2-lattice decompositions as opposed to triangulations (as in [BCK$^+$16]) to decompose a manifold into smaller pieces has the advantage that fewer cells are needed, leading to microscopic Hilbert spaces of much smaller rank in many cases. We illustrate this fact by fully determining the spectrum of the Hamiltonian of higher lattice gauge theory on the 3-sphere with few cells.

In passing from triangulations to 2-lattices we were also able to demonstrate the internal consistency of the model in [BCK$^+$16] which tacitly assumed that discrete 2-holonomy is well defined, for instance when proving in *loc cit* that the ground state degeneracy is a topological invariant derived from Yetter TQFT.

A consequence of using cell decompositions instead of triangulations is the loss of some combinatorial structure. Some basic algebraic topology is required in order to prove that the model is well defined. In doing the latter, we also construct a lattice description of non-abelian discrete 2-dimensional holonomies along disks and spheres, to model higher gauge fields on a 2-lattice.

The construction in this paper heavily uses the crucial notion of '2-lattices', a slighlty combinatorialised version of CW-complexes. We describe the class of 2-lattices, the Hilbert space for lattice higher gauge theory, and the higher gauge symmetry in a rigorous manner.

More concretely, in §3 and §4 we parallel the construction of ordinary (lattice) gauge theory in a higher setting, as outlined in [BCK$^+$16]. Geometry of higher-order bundles and ideas of higher-dimensional holonomy are discussed for example in [BS07, SW13, SW11, FP11]. We present a fully combinatorial lattice version of the surface-holonomy of a higher-order bundle. (This is in line with the framework for higher lattice gauge theory of [Pfe03] and formal homotopy quantum field theory [PT05].) We also prove that discrete 2-dimensional holonomy is independent of the way we decompose a 2-sphere into faces and also gauge invariant, which is one of the points in which we needed to invoke some basic algebraic topology. We explain and give proofs of the necessary well-definedness theorems, in the context of the machinery set up in [BCK$^+$16].

The well-definedness of 1-lattice gauge theory can be expressed by saying that there is a lattice groupoid supporting well-defined groupoid maps to a gauge groupoid. These maps are called *gauge configurations*. The gauge groupoid is simply a gauge group made a groupoid in the obvious way, so the task here is to take the notion of lattice groupoid suitably for such a target, while retaining the requirement that the lattice represents physical space. From this perspective it is a physical (phenomenological) and philosophical point that gauge fields taking values in groups are consistent targets. (If space has certain properties, such as continuous metric topology, then the group will have to mirror these. But this will not concern us for now.)

The 'lattice groupoid' is a groupoid version of the free category over a graph (as for example in [Mac98]) for a suitable graph. It is the freeness that makes gauge configurations well-defined. A 'suitable graph'

is (it is claimed) the 1-skeleton of a suitable CW-complex decomposition of physical space. If we aim for *topological* field theory then in principle any regular CW-complex will do. Normally there is a notion of local structure — chunks of space that are independent of each other, which collectively encode extended structure. In this sense, the 'big story' of lattice gauge theory is that the free groupoid over a suitable lattice is an adequate model of physical space.

Our first task here is to construct a well-defined lift of these notions to the higher setting. We construct such a lift, and the first main result is a well-definedness theorem, Theorem 8 applied for the fundamental crossed module of the homotopy groupoids π_2 and π_1 of the lattice. As before, this is essentially a freeness theorem. Indeed it is essentially a classical freeness theorem of Whitehead. However the mechanics are a lot more involved in this case, which gives us more to get hold of on the physics side, as we discuss below. In particular, in Section 2.5, we show that, given a crossed module of groups (E, G), and maps to 2- and to 1-simplices assigning elements of the groups E and G respectively (that satisfies a certain compatibility condition — called fake-flatness), extends uniquely to a crossed module map to the fundamental crossed module. In analogy to lattice gauge theory, we define gauge configurations and their 2-holonomies associated to 2-subcomplexes; and show using topology that they depend only on the basepoint and not on other other data like the order of multiplication of constituent 2-cells.

Initially as a technical device, we introduce gauge 'transformations' of two types, vertex and edge type. These obey a semi-direct product structure. This is shown explicitly using a double category on the crossed module. Gauge transformations leave 2-flatness of 2-holonomies invariant, so the usage of language is justified.

The solution of this exercise, formally analogous to the well-known 1-lattice gauge theory case, fills a gap in higher lattice gauge theory using CW-complex decomposition of manifolds for the underlying 2-lattice.

Overview of the paper

An overview of the paper is as follows. In §2 we recap the necessary background and define conventions for: crossed modules, fundamental crossed modules, and CW-complexes. In §3 we define 2-lattices and consider higher lattice gauge configurations (called "cellular formal $\mathcal{C}$-maps" in [PT05]). We also analyse the surface holonomy of higher order lattice gauge configurations. The proof that this 2-dimensional holonomy is well defined is also given. In §4 we introduce a notion of 'gauge transformation' between higher gauge configurations (on a lattice) and prove that such preserves 2-dimensional holonomy.

In §5 we define a Hilbert space for a higher lattice gauge theory. This Hilbert space is the free vector space on the set of fake-flat gauge configurations and coincides with the Hilbert space in [BCK$^+$16] for triangulated manifolds. We consider a Hamiltonian model for higher lattice gauge theory which is a Hamiltonian formulation of the Yetter homotopy 2-type TQFT for CW-complexes [FMP07]. The Hamiltonian is a sum of three mutually commuting terms: two sums over 1- and 2-cells, respectively, imposing higher gauge invariance and one over 3-cells imposing 2-flatness. We show that the dimension of the ground state is given by the number of homotopy classes of maps from the space manifold to the classifying space of the (gauge-)crossed module and therefore is a topological (in fact homotopy) invariant (At this point we needed again to appeal to some basic algebraic topology for crossed modules as given in [BHS11].). This ground state degeneracy can also be proven to coincide with Yetter's invariant on $M \times S^1$ (the level D invariant of the TQFT); see [BCK$^+$16].

We finish by giving the total diagonalisation of the Hamiltonian for higher lattice gauge theory in the 3-sphere with two particular cell decompositions. This example gives hints toward the behaviour of level D-2/D-3 TQFT. These calculations indicate that in lattice higher gauge theory we have excited states that combine charge and (higher order) flux as in Kitaev's quantum-double model [Kit03]. More concretely we have states which we call 2-fluxes, supported on a 2-sphere, with well-defined non-trivial 2-dimensional holonomy. The Hilbert space associated to a 2-flux decomposes into edge charge spaces, supported in embedded strings. The latter Hilbert spaces further decompose into point-like vertex internal charges.

2 Higher lattice gauge theory preliminaries

In Section 3.2 we give the definition of a higher lattice gauge configuration. This makes extensive use of crossed modules, and we assemble the key definitions in §2.1. (Crossed modules are well-known to be equivalent to strict 2-groups [BHS11], thus from now on only crossed modules will be mentioned.) Then in §2.2 we recall some facts about CW-complexes which we will need later for defining higher order lattices.

Crossed modules of groups (and of groupoids) can be used for formalising 2-dimensional (2D) notions of holonomy (surface holonomy), in the same way that groups appear in the formulation of the holonomy of a bundle.

2.1 Crossed modules

Let E and G be groups. A *crossed module* $\mathcal{G} = (\partial\colon E \to G, \triangleright)$ of groups (see [BL04, Bro99, Far09]) is given by a group map $\partial\colon E \to G$, together with a left action of G on E by automorphisms, such that the relations below, called Peiffer relations, hold for each $g \in G$ and $e, e' \in E$:

$$\partial(g \triangleright e) = g\partial(e)g^{-1}, \tag{1}$$

$$\partial(e) \triangleright e' = ee'e^{-1}. \tag{2}$$

Example 1. The crossed module $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{32} := (\partial : \mathbb{Z}_3^+ \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times, \triangleright)$, where $\mathbb{Z}_3^+ = \{0, 1, 2\}$ is the additive group of integers module 3 and $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times = \{\pm 1\}$ acts on $\mathbb{Z}_3$ as $z \triangleright e = ze$. The boundary map ∂ sends everything to $+1$.

Crossed modules of groupoids can also be considered [BHS11, Bro99, FMP07]. Firstly, let $G = (\sigma, \tau\colon G_1 \to G_0)$ denote a groupoid with set of objects G_0; set of morphisms G_1; and source and target maps $\sigma, \tau\colon G_1 \to G_0$. We represent the morphisms of G as $\sigma(\gamma) = a \xrightarrow{\gamma} b = \tau(\gamma)$, where $\gamma \in G_1$. The composition map in G is represented as (notice composition order):

$$\big(a \xrightarrow{\gamma} b\big) \circ \big(b \xrightarrow{\gamma'} c\big) = \big(a \xrightarrow{\gamma\gamma'} c\big).$$

Next, a *totally intransitive groupoid* E is a groupoid of the form $E = (\beta, \beta\colon E_1 \to E_0)$, thus source and target maps coincide. This is essentially a disjoint union of groups: given $x \in E_0$, we let $E_x = \{e \in E_1 : \beta(e) = x\}$, which clearly is a group.

A *left groupoid action* $\triangleright$ of the groupoid $G = (\sigma, \tau\colon G_1 \to C)$ on $E = (\beta, \beta\colon E_1 \to C)$, a totally intransitive groupoid with the same set of objects as G, is given by a set map:

$$(\gamma, e) \in \{(\gamma', e') \in G_1 \times E_1 : \tau(\gamma') = \beta(e')\} \longmapsto \gamma \triangleright e \in E_1,$$

such that whenever compositions and actions are well-defined:

$$\beta(\gamma \triangleright e) = \sigma(\gamma), \qquad (\gamma\gamma') \triangleright e = \gamma \triangleright (\gamma' \triangleright e) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \gamma \triangleright (ee') = (\gamma \triangleright e)(\gamma \triangleright e').$$

Finally, let E and G be groupoids with the same object set, with E totally intransitive. A *crossed module of groupoids* $\mathcal{G} = (\partial\colon E \to G, \triangleright)$ is given by a groupoid map $\partial\colon E \to G$, which is the identity on objects, together with a left action of G on E such that the Peiffer relations (1,2) are satisfied, whenever actions and compositions make sense. Note that if x is an object of G, and putting $G_x = \{\gamma \in G_1 : \sigma(\gamma), \tau(\gamma) = x\}$, which is a group (the automorphism group of x), and E_x as above, then the restriction of ∂ to E_x and the restricted action of G_x on E_x defines a crossed module of groups $\mathcal{G}_x$.

A map $(\partial\colon E \to G, \triangleright) \to (\partial\colon E' \to G', \triangleright)$ of crossed modules of groupoids is given by a pair of groupoid maps $\psi\colon E \to E'$ and $\phi\colon G \to G'$ which is compatible with actions and boundary maps.

2.1.1 Example: fundamental crossed module

The main example of a crossed module of groupoids is a topological one crucial to our construction. We will need a sequence of definitions as follows.

Definition 2.1. (See e.g. [CF12, p.17].) Let Y be a locally path-connected space, and $C \subset Y$ discrete. The *fundamental groupoid of Y, with object set C*, is denoted by $\pi_1(Y, C)$. The set of objects of $\pi_1(Y, C)$ is C and the set of morphism $\hom(c, d)$ is given by equivalence classes of paths $\gamma\colon [0, 1] \to Y$, such that $\gamma(0) = c$ and $\gamma(1) = d$, where two paths $c \to d$ are equivalent if they are homotopic in Y relative to the end-points (i.e. end-points are to remain stable during the homotopy). The composition in $\pi_1(Y, C)$ is given by concatenation (and rescaling) of representative paths.

If γ is a path in Y the equivalence class it belongs to in $\pi_1(Y, C)$ is denoted by $[\gamma]$. A morphism from c to d is denoted as $c \xrightarrow{[\gamma]} d$ or simply by $c \xrightarrow{\gamma} d$ if no ambiguity arises.

Definition 2.2. (See e.g. [Hat02, p.343].) Let X be a locally path-connected space. Let $Y \subset X$ be a locally path connected subspace of Y. Choose a discrete set $C \subset Y$, where C intersects non-trivially each path-component of X and of Y. For each $c \in C$, consider the *relative homotopy group* $\pi_2(X, Y, c)$. This group is made out of homotopy classes of maps $\Gamma\colon [0,1]^2 \to X$ such that

$$\Gamma \in \begin{array}{ccc} c & \xrightarrow{Y} & c \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ c & X & c \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ c & \xrightarrow{c} & c \end{array}.$$

And by the latter we mean:

1. $\Gamma\big(([0,1] \times \{0\}) \cup (\{0,1\} \times [0,1])\big) = c$,
2. $\Gamma\left([0,1] \times \{1\}\right) \subset Y$.

Two such maps $\Gamma, \Gamma'\colon [0,1]^2 \to X$ are said to be homotopic if there exists a homotopy $J\colon [0,1]^3 \to X$, connecting Γ and Γ' such that for all $u \in [0,1]$ the slice of J at u, namely $(t,s) \mapsto J_u(t,s) = J(t,s,u)$, satisfies the properties 1 and 2. The elements $[\Gamma] \in \pi_2(X, Y, c)$, or simply $\Gamma \in \pi_2(X, Y, c)$, if no confusion arises, are visualised as:

$$\Gamma = \begin{array}{ccc} c & \xrightarrow{\partial(\Gamma)} & c \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ c & \Gamma & c \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ c & \xrightarrow{c} & c \end{array}.$$

The multiplication in $\pi_2(X, Y, c)$ is through horizontal juxtaposition.

We thus have a totally intransitive groupoid $\pi_2(X, Y, C) \doteq \bigsqcup_{c \in C} \pi_2(X, Y, c)$, whose set of objects is C. Given $c \in C$, restricting a $\Gamma \in \pi_2(X, Y, c)$ to the top of the square $[0,1]^2$ gives rise to an element $\partial(\Gamma) \in \pi_1(Y, c)$, and this correspondence is a group map $\partial\colon \pi_2(X, Y, c) \to \pi_1(Y, c)$.

Proposition 2. (JHC Whitehead, [BHS11, Hat02]) Considering the natural action $\triangleright$ of the groupoid $\pi_1(Y, C)$ on the totally intransitive groupoid $\pi_2(X, Y, C)$ as in figure 1; and the boundary map $\partial\colon \pi_2(X, Y, C) \to \pi_1(Y, C)$, we have a crossed module of groupoids, called the fundamental crossed module of (X, Y, C):

$$\Pi_2(X, Y, C) \;=\; (\partial\colon \pi_2(X, Y, C) \to \pi_1(Y, C), \triangleright).$$



Figure 1: The action of an element $\gamma \in \pi_1(Y, C)$, with $\gamma(0) = c$ and $\gamma(1) = d$ on a $\Gamma \in \pi_2(X, Y, c)$.

2.2 CW-complexes

Let D^n denote the closed n-disk in the form $D^n = [0,1]^n$. Given an n-manifold M then $\mathrm{int}(M)$ denotes the subset of points with open Euclidean neighbourhood. Define

$$\partial D^n = S^{n-1} = D^n \setminus \mathrm{int}(D^n)$$

— the boundary of the n-disk. Recall [Hat02, FP90]:

Definition 2.3 (CW-complex)**.** A CW-complex $(X, \{\phi^n_a\}_a)$ is a (Hausdorff) topological space, together with, for each n, a family of continuous maps: $\phi^n_a\colon D^n_a \to X$ (the 'characteristic maps'), where $\{D^n_a\}_a$ is a collection of closed n-disks, such that the conditions below hold:

1. Characteristic map ϕ_a^n restricts to a homeomorphism $\mathrm{int}(D_a^n) \to \phi_a^n(\mathrm{int}(D_a^n))$.
2. The sets $e_a^n = \phi_a^n(\mathrm{int}(D_a^n)) \subset X$, called the *open cells* of X, form a partition of X.
3. Put $\partial(e_a^n) = \phi_a^n(\partial(D_a^n)) \subset X$, the border of the n-cell. Each $\partial(e_a^n)$ is contained in the union of a finite number of open cells of dimension $< n$.
4. A set $F \subset X$ is closed if, and only if, $(\phi_a^n)^{-1}(F)$ is closed in each D_a^n.

We write X for $(X, \{\phi_a^n\}_a)$ where no ambiguity arises.
The *n-skeleton* of a CW-complex is the set X^n which is the union of all the open cells of dimensions $\leq n$.

Some quick points are:

- A closed cell $\overline{e_a^n} \subset X$ is, by definition, the closure (in X) of e_a^n. We have $\overline{e_a^n} = \phi_a^n(D_a^n)$.
- The *attaching map* of each open cell e_a^n is the restriction of the map $\phi_a^n \colon D_a^n \to X$ to $\partial(D_a^n)$, namely:

$$\psi_a^n \colon \partial(D_a^n) \to \partial(e_a^n) \subset X^{n-1} \subset X.$$

- A *subcomplex* of a CW-complex is a subspace $A \subset X$ which is the union of open cells of X, such that the closure of any cell is contained in A. A subcomplex is a CW-complex (this requires proof).

For $(X, \{\phi_a^n\}_a)$ a CW-complex we define $L^i = \{\phi_a^i(D^i)\}_a$ — the set of closed i-cells. Thus

$$X^i = \bigcup_{j=0}^{i} \bigcup_{c \in L^i} c$$

The collection $L = (L^0, L^1, L^2, L^3, ...)$ is the *CW-decomposition* of X. We call L^0 the set of points or vertices; L^1 the set of edges or *tracks*; L^2 the set of faces or *plaquettes*; L^3 the set of 3-faces or *blobs*.

A 'combinatorial' example of a CW-complex is any simplicial complex. But the above definition of CW-complex is non-combinatorial, in that the characteristic maps of the n-cells can be highly singular, in the sense of [Hat02]. Intermediate restrictions in the definition of a CW-complex are the following:

Definition 2.4 (Regular CW-complex)**.** A CW-complex is called i-regular if each i-dimensional characteristic map is an embedding; and *regular* if i-regular for all i. Equivalently, a CW-complex is regular if each attaching map is a homeomorphism. In a regular CW-complex the closed n-cells each are therefore homeomorphic to the n-disk.

Definition 2.5 (Normal[1] CW-complex)**.** A CW-complex is *normal* if each closed n-cell is a subcomplex.

A normal CW-complex is not necessarily regular (an example is the usual cell decomposition of S^1 with one 0-cell and one 1-cell). However, a regular CW-complex is necessarily normal; see for instance [LW69].

Our definition of a 2-lattice below is similar to the CW-decomposition of a regular CW-complex (that is a manifold). However we only impose (albeit stronger versions of) *regularity* and *normality* at certain dimensions: a) No condition needs to be imposed for 0 and 1-cells; since at these levels embeddings are always non-singular. b) A normality condition is imposed for 2-cells and for 3-cells. c) No condition is imposed for cells of dimension 4 or higher.

3 Higher lattice gauge theory

Note that given a CW-complex, then together with the directions inherited from the characteristic maps, (L^0, L^1) has the structure of a directed graph. There is also a 'doubled' graph with a further reverse edge for each edge.

Definition 3.1 (Quantised path)**.** Given a CW-complex, one can form certain paths on the 1-skeleton by chaining together paths from the subset consisting of the characteristic maps of 1-cells; their 'reverses'; and constant paths on vertices, and then rescaling. We called such paths *quantised*.

[1] This definition of normality should not be confused with the notion of normality in point-set topology

Definition 3.2 (Topological 2-lattice)**.** A topological 2-lattice is a pair (M, L) where M is a topological manifold and $L = (L^0, L^1, L^2, L^3)$ is the up to 3-dimensional part of a 3-regular CW-decomposition of M, together with, for each cell x, a *base point* $\beta_0(x)$ in $\partial x \cap L^0$; and for each 2-cell an orientation. We impose:

L1. Parameterising $S^1 = \partial D^2_a$ clockwise (say) from the base point, then the attaching map $\psi^2_a \colon S^1 \to M^1$ of each 2-cell is a quantised path.

L2. The boundary of each blob gives a subcomplex of M^2.

L3. If M has dimension 3, or lower, we impose that $M^3 = M$. Otherwise, we impose that a CW-decomposition of M should exist extending M^3 and with all additional cells having dimension ≥ 4.

Quick points:

1. The characteristic maps are not retained in the data of a lattice, but since there must exist such data for an underlying CW-complex, we can use it in stipulating cell properties. Thus L1 makes sense.

2. L1 implies 2-normality since closed 2-cells will then be subcomplexes.

3. L1 means that for $P \in L^2$ we can define a quantised closed path $\partial_L P$ starting at the base point of P, whose underlying set is ∂P.

4. Together with the base points, (L^0, L^1) has the structure of a directed graph.



Figure 2: The 1-dimensional part of a 2-lattice.

Example 3. In figure 2, let us add plaquettes, P_1, P_2, P_3 and P_4, based at v_1, v_2, v_3 and v_1, with

$$\partial_L P_1 = t_5 t_2, \qquad \partial_L P_2 = t_3^{-1} t_1^{-1} t_5, \qquad \partial_L P_3 = t_4 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_L P_4 = t_1 t_4^{-1} t_3 t_2.$$

In this case the underlying 'surface' M is the 2-sphere. This example is neither 1-regular nor 2-regular (the latter due to the way whereby the 2-cell P_4 attaches, thus a double point of $\partial(P_4)$ exist in v_3).

Example 4 (Two lattice decompositions of the 3-sphere S^3)**.** These are two lattice decompositions of the 3-sphere which will play a major role when discussing higher lattice gauge theory in the 3-sphere in §5.3.

$(S^3, L_{\mathfrak{g}})$**:** Let us consider the 3-sphere S^3 with the globe decomposition as follows. We have a unique 0-cell v at the point of zero latitude and longitude, and a unique 1-cell t making the equator, oriented eastwards. We have two 2-cells, p, p', one for each hemisphere, which attach along the equator (oriented eastwards). Up to now we described a cell decomposition of S^2. To get from S^2 to S^3 we now need to add two additional 3-cells b, b' attaching on each side of the 2-sphere. This example is not 1-regular but it is 2-regular.



(S^3, L_0)**:** We can choose an even simpler lattice decomposition L_0 of S^3, having unique 0 and 2-cells (resulting in S^2), and two blobs b and b', as above, attaching along each side of the 2-sphere. This is not 2-regular.

3.1 More paths on the lattice

See [BHS11, BH11] for a discussion of paths and homotopy.

Definition 3.3. Given a directed graph (V, E), the *(free) groupoid* $FG\langle V, E\rangle$ is the groupoid with object set V and arrows given by the set of 'paths'. Here a path $v \xrightarrow{\gamma} v'$ from v to v' (both vertices) is a sequence $\gamma = t_1^{\theta_1} \dots t_n^{\theta_n}$ where $t_i \in E$ and $\theta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$, such that the initial point of $t_i^{\theta_i}$ (defined for t_i^1 to be the initial point of t_i, and for t_i^{-1} to be the final point of t_i) coincides with the final point of $t_{i-1}^{\theta_{i-1}}$ (with the analogous definition). The (sub)paths $t_i^{\pm 1} t_i^{\mp 1}$ are identified with the empty sequence. (This identification distinguishes a 'path' from a 'quantised path'; Def 3.1.) Paths are concatenated in the obvious way.

The notion of *freeness* will be important in our construction. We use freeness of a crossed module of groupoids. This is a non-trivial construction, so to prepare for this we now take the oportunity to recall what it means to say that the groupoid is 'free' in Def.3.3 above. Recall [Mac98] that a category (respectively groupoid) C is free over a graph G if there is a graph map $P : G \to UC$ (where UC is the underlying graph of C) satisfying the following property. For every category/groupoid B with graph map $D : G \to UB$ there is a unique functor $D' : C \to B$ so that the diagram below commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G & \xrightarrow{P} & UC \\ & \searrow^{D} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle UD'} \\ & & UB \end{array} \tag{3}$$

Lemma 5. [Mac98] The groupoid $FG\langle V, E\rangle$ is free over (V, E). □

Proposition 6. ([Bro06, BHS11]) Let (M, L) be a 2-lattice. The fundamental groupoid $\pi_1(M^1, M^0)$, as defined in Def.2.1, is isomorphic to the free groupoid $FG\langle L^0, L^1\rangle$ with set of objects being $M^0 = L^0$ and with a free generator $x \xrightarrow{t} y$ for each track $t \in L^1$. (Here x and y are the source and target of t.) □

In particular, for any group G and for any map $f\colon L^1 \to G$ there exists a unique groupoid map $f'\colon \pi_1(M^1, M^0) \to G$ extending f. (The same holds if G is a groupoid, except that we must pay attention to base-points.) As we will see in §3.2, this observation lies at the heart of the realisation of gauge theory that we will lift to the higher case.

3.2 Higher order gauge configurations

In order to establish a template for the 'higher' construction, we start with a suitable characterisation of *ordinary* gauge configurations. Recall, for example from [Mac98], that for every pair of categories C, D there is a category (C, D) of functors from C to D and natural transformations between functors.

Given a group G, a *gauge configuration* on a lattice $(M, L = (L^0, L^1, ...))$ is a map

$$F : L^1 \to G.$$

By freeness of $FG\langle L^0, L^1\rangle$ (Lem.5) this extends to a uniquely defined groupoid morphism

$$F : FG\langle L^0, L^1\rangle \to G$$

where G is regarded as the groupoid with one object; and every functor in $(FG\langle L^0, L^1\rangle, G)$ arises this way. By Prop.6 this assigns a well-defined element of G to any combinatorial path in $\pi_1(M^1, M^0)$.

Given a lattice (M, L) and the object set $(FG\langle L^0, L^1\rangle, G)$ of functors we may define for each character $\chi : G \to \mathbb{C}$ a Wilson action $H_\chi : (FG\langle L^0, L^1\rangle, G) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$H_\chi(F) = \sum_{p \in L^2} Re(\chi(F(\partial p)))...$$

(see e.g. [Wil74], [Kog79, §8], [Mar91, §10.2] or [Oec05, §1.2]). Note that this depends strongly on the cell-decomposition of M, as well as M. Now the process of explaining the details of this formula should also explain (some of) why the definition of lattice takes the form it does; see [Kog79].

We have one more reference point: Given a set Q, a 0-gauge configuration (or just a spin configuration) is a map $F : L^0 \to Q$. A classical Potts Hamiltonian $H : hom(L^0, Q) \to \mathbb{R}$ is $H(F) = \sum_{t \in L^1} \delta_{F(\partial t)}$ where $\delta_{F(\partial t)} = 1$ if the source and tail evaluate the same, and zero otherwise. (In fact this construction is amenable to generalisation, but the point here is to pass the other way now – to 2-gauge theory.)

Higher order gauge configurations were essentially defined in [Yet93]. Algebraic topology interpretations were extensively studied in [Far09, FMP07, Far07], following the work of Brown and Higgins on fundamental crossed modules of pairs of spaces and 2-dimensional van Kampen theorem [BH81b, BH81a, BHS11]. We will address this below. The inherent (and independently addressed) differential-geometric higher gauge theory was addressed in [BS07, SW13, SW11, FP11]. Finally, homotopy quantum field theory applications of such appear in [PT05] (and were there "called formal $\mathcal{C}$ maps").

Definition 3.4 (Fake-flat configuration)**.** Let $\mathcal{G} = (\partial_{\mathcal{G}} \colon E \to G, \triangleright)$ be a crossed module of groups. Given $\mathcal{G}$, a 2-gauge configuration $\mathcal{F} = (g, e)$ based on a 2-lattice (M, L) is given by:

- A map $g : L^1 \to G$, denoted $\gamma \mapsto g_\gamma$.
- A map $e : L^2 \to E$, denoted $P \mapsto e_P$.

(Fake flatness) We impose that given a plaquette P, with boundary being the quantised path $\partial_L(P) = \gamma_1^{\theta_1} \dots \gamma_n^{\theta_n}$, then the following fake-flatness condition holds:

$$\partial_{\mathcal{G}}(e_P)^{-1} \ = g_{\gamma_1}^{\theta_1} \dots g_{\gamma_n}^{\theta_n}. \tag{4}$$

An example appears in figure 3. Here the plaquette P is based on the vertex v_1.



$$\partial_{\mathcal{G}}(e_P) \ = g_4^{-1} g_3^{-1} g_2^{-1} g_1^{-1}.$$

Figure 3: A fake flat gauge configuration. The plaquette is based at v_1.

Let $\Phi(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ denote the set of fake-flat configurations. Note that $\Phi(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ is non-empty. In particular the 'naive vacuum' Ω_1 given by $\mathcal{F}(x) = 1$ for all cells x is fake-flat.

3.2.1 The physical role of a lattice: Review of Whitehead theorem

Let (M, L) be a 2-lattice. Then (M^2, M^1) is a pair of locally path-connected spaces. In addition M^0 is discrete and intersects any connected component of M^1 and M^2.

Observe that to make use of our '2-gauge configuration' we need corresponding lifts of Lemma 5 and Prop.6. Analogously to Prop.6, the crossed module $\Pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0)$ is isomorphic to the free crossed module on the attaching maps of the plaquettes. This result (proven in the general case of CW-complexes) is due to JHC Whitehead. Let us explicate Whitehead's theorem. This is an old theorem. Modern treatments can be found in [BHS11, Bro99].

First we specify what "crossed module freeness" is. Let $G = (\sigma, \tau \colon G_1 \to G_0)$ be a groupoid. Let also K be a set mapping to G_0, through a map β_0. Suppose also that we have a map $\partial_0 \colon K \to G_1$ that makes the diagram below commute (therefore $\beta_0 = \tau \circ \partial_0$ and $\beta_0 = \sigma \circ \partial_0$):



(5)

(This in particular means that ∂_0 is a map from K into the set of arrows in G that have the same source and target.) Let $F = (\beta\colon F_1 \to G_0)$ be a totally intransitive groupoid with the same set of objects as G. We say that a crossed module of groupoids $(\partial\colon F \to G, \triangleright)$ is free on $\partial_0\colon K \to G_1$ if there exists an inclusion map $i\colon K \to F_1$ making the diagram below commute:



such that the following universal property is satisfied: *Given any crossed module $(\partial'\colon E' \to G', \triangleright)$ of groupoids, any groupoid map $\phi\colon G \to G'$ and any set map $\psi_0\colon K \to E'_1$ (the set of arrows of E') such that $\partial' \circ \psi_0 = \phi \circ \partial_0$ then there exists a unique groupoid map $\psi\colon F \to E'$ making the diagram below commutative:*



or leaving in all information:



and so that the pair (ψ, ϕ) of groupoid maps is a crossed module map $(\partial\colon F \to G) \to (\partial'\colon E' \to G')$.

Lemma 7. Given $\partial_0\colon K \to G_1$, the groupoid F is uniquely specified up to isomorphism by the universal property above. A model for F is the following. First of all consider the totally intransitive groupoid with set of objects being G_0 and free generators being

$$\sigma(g) \xrightarrow{(g,k)} \sigma(g) \text{ where } g \in G_1 \text{ and } k \in K \text{ are such that } \tau(g) = \beta_0(k).$$

This groupoid has a natural left action by automorphisms of the groupoid G (just compose morphisms in G). A natural groupoid map to G exists which on free generators has the form

$$\partial\left(\sigma(g) \xrightarrow{(g,k)} \sigma(g)\right) \;=\; \sigma(g) \xrightarrow{g\partial_0(k)g^{-1}} \sigma(g).$$

Then F is obtained from the latter free groupoid by (minimally) imposing that the second Peiffer relation holds. (The first relation holds on the nose.)

Proof. Routine. Details are in [BHS11, Bro99]. □

Going back to the crossed module $\Pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0)$, each plaquette P has its border the quantised path $\partial_L(P) = {p_1}^{\theta_1^P} \dots {p_{n_P}}^{\theta_{n_P}^P}$, where $\theta^{P_i} \in \{\pm 1\}$ and each p_i is a track. Given the way we defined plaquettes P, these have a chosen base-point $\beta_0(P) = c_P$. Considering the quantised path $\partial_L(P)$ up to homotopy defines an element $\partial_0(P) \in \pi_1(M^1, c_P)$. We thus have a set map

$$\partial_0\colon L^2 \to \pi_1(M^1, M^0)$$

such that $\partial_0(P)$ is a closed path for each plaquette P, and moreover $\beta_0(P) = \sigma(\partial_0(P)) = \tau(\partial_0(P))$ (σ, τ the source and target maps of $\pi_1(M^1, M^0)$); cf. diagram (5).

Theorem 8 (Whitehead Theorem)**.** Let (M, L) be a 2-lattice, or indeed any CW-complex. Then the crossed module $\Pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0) = (\partial : \pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0) \to \pi_1(M^1, M^0), \triangleright)$ is free on $\partial_0 \colon L^2 \to \pi_1(M^1, M^0)$.

This in particular means that we have inclusion (set) map $i \colon L^2 \to \pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0)$, with $\partial \circ i = \partial_0$ and that if $G' = (\sigma, \tau \colon G'_1 \to G'_0)$ is a groupoid, $(\partial' \colon E' \to G', \triangleright)$ is a crossed module of groupoids and $\phi \colon \pi_1(M^1, M^0) \to G'$ is a groupoid map, then given any map $\psi_0 \colon L^2 \to E'$ such that $\phi \circ \partial = \partial' \circ \psi_0$ there exists a unique groupoid map $\psi \colon \pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0) \to E'$ making the diagram below commutative and also making the pair (ψ, ϕ) a crossed module map (thus (ψ, ϕ) is compatible with boundaries and groupoid actions):



(We will mainly use this universal property in the case when $(\partial' \colon E' \to G', \triangleright)$ is a crossed module of groups in which case there is not much to worry about maps on object sets of groupoids.)

For proofs see [BHS11, Bro99], where Whitehead's theorem (in the unbased case, which Whitehead did not discuss) is deduced from the much more general 2-dimensional van Kampen theorem.

Remark 9. Note that Whitehead's theorem together with the construction of free crossed modules (above) implies that the totally intransitive groupoid $\pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0)$ is generated by $\sigma(g) \xrightarrow{g \triangleright i(P)} \sigma(g)$, where $g \in \pi_1(M^1, M^0)$ and $P \in L^2$ is such that: $c_P = \tau(g)$; recall that $\sigma(g)$ and $\tau(g)$ are the initial and end-points of g. It is this fact which makes the construction of the Hamiltonian version of Yetter's TQFT in [BCK$^+$16] well defined. This will be made more explicit by Lemmas 10 and 13.

3.2.2 Some more algebraic topology preliminaries

Let $M = M^2$ be an oriented surface — specifically a 2-disk. Consider a (topological) 2-lattice L whose underlying space is M. Choose a vertex $v \in L^0$ (for simplicity, we impose it to be located in the boundary of the 2-disk) to be the base point of M.

Definition 3.5. The oriented boundary $\partial_v M$ of M is the following quantised path in M^1 (from v to v):

$$\partial_v(M) = \gamma_1^{\theta_1} \dots \gamma_n^{\theta_n},$$

(Note that if we forget the starting point and decomposition data here this is simply ∂M.)

If we allow the cancellation of consecutive pairs of a path and its inverse (therefore passing to $FG\langle L^0, L^1\rangle$, Def 3.3), it is possible to express - however not uniquely - $\partial_v(M)$ as the product of boundaries of plaquettes (or their inverses), each of which should in addition be conjugated by a (possibly trivial) path in M^1, connecting v with the base-point of each plaquette. More precisely:

Lemma 10. Let M be a 2-disk, (M, L) a lattice, and $v \in L^0 \cap \partial(M)$. There exists a positive integer N, plaquettes $P_i, i = 1, \dots N$ in L^2 (plaquettes can be repeated) and integers $\theta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ (where $i = 1, \dots N$), as well as paths $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N$ in M^1, connecting v to the base point of each plaquette, such that (where consecutive pairs of a path and its inverse can be cancelled; Def 3.3):

$$\partial_v(M) \;\equiv\; \left(\gamma_1 \partial(P_1)^{\theta_1} \gamma_1^{-1}\right)\; \left(\gamma_2 \partial(P_2)^{\theta_2} \gamma_2^{-1}\right) \dots \left(\gamma_N \partial(P_N)^{\theta_N} \gamma_N^{-1}\right).$$

Proof. Let us give a purely topological proof of this fact. Let us consider the fundamental crossed module $\Pi_2(M, M^1, v)$ of M. Given that $\pi_2(M^1) = 0$, since M^1 is a graph, the long homotopy exact sequence of the pointed pair (M, M^1) gives (see e.g. [Hat02]) an exact sequence:

$$\{0\} \to \pi_2(M^2, M^1, v) \xrightarrow{\partial} \pi_1(M^1, v) \to \pi_1(M^2, v) \cong \{1\}.$$

Thus ∂ is an isomorphism. Let $g = \partial(M^2)$ (thus g is the counterclockwise loop along the boundary of the 2-disk). Choose $e \in \pi_1(M^2, M^1, v) \subset \pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0)$ such that $\partial(e) = g$. (By construction e is unique.

This will not be used in this proof but will have prime importance later in the proof of Lemma 13.) Note that $\partial(e)$ is based at v by construction.

Given that $\pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0)$ is a free-crossed module on the plaquettes applying remark 9, we can now choose plaquettes $P_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$ and paths γ_i from the base point v_i of P_i to P_i and integers θ_i such that

$$e = (\gamma_1 \triangleright P_1)^{\theta_1} (\gamma_2 \triangleright P_2)^{\theta_2} \ldots (\gamma_N \triangleright P_N)^{\theta_N},$$

and therefore (by using the first Peiffer Law):

$$\partial_v(M) = \partial(e) = \gamma_1 \partial(P_1)^{\theta_1} \gamma_1^{-1}\ \gamma_2 \partial(P_2)^{\theta_2} \gamma_2^{-1} \ldots \gamma_N \partial(P_N)^{\theta_N} \gamma_N^{-1}.$$

□

Remark 11. Even though the product $(\gamma_1 \triangleright P_1)^{\theta_1} (\gamma_2 \triangleright P_2)^{\theta_2} \ldots (\gamma_N \triangleright P_N)^{\theta_N}$ is by definition unique in $\pi_2(M^2, M^1, v)$, the actual assignment:

$$\begin{aligned} &i \mapsto P_i, \text{ a plaquete,} \\ &i \mapsto \gamma_i, \text{ a path from the base point of the plaquette } P_i \text{ to } v, \\ &i \mapsto \theta_i \in \{\pm 1\} \end{aligned}$$

$i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, where N is a positive integer, such that:

$$\partial_v(M) = \left(\gamma_1 \partial(P_1)^{\theta_1} \gamma_1^{-1}\right)\ \left(\gamma_2 \partial(P_2)^{\theta_2} \gamma_2^{-1}\right) \ldots \left(\gamma_N \partial(P_N)^{\theta_N} \gamma_N^{-1}\right)$$

or equivalently:

$$e = (\gamma_1 \triangleright P_1)^{\theta_1} (\gamma_2 \triangleright P_2)^{\theta_2} \ldots (\gamma_N \triangleright P_N)^{\theta_N}$$

is far from being unique. Transformations that we can do are (by using the relation $ef = f\partial(f)^{-1} \triangleright e$, a consequence of the second Peiffer relation in a crossed module):

$$\left(\gamma_i \triangleright P_i^{\theta_i}\right) \left(\gamma_j \triangleright P_j^{\theta_j}\right) = \left(\gamma_j \triangleright P_j^{\theta_j}\right) \left((\gamma_j^{-1} \partial(P_j)^{-\theta_j} \gamma_j \gamma_i) \triangleright P_i^{\theta_i}\right).$$

Using this we can certainly modify the map $i \mapsto P_i$ in order that a particular plaquette $P \in L^2$ appears in a cluster, namely $P = P_i \implies i \in \{a = a_P, a+1, \ldots, b = b_P\}$. The proof of the previous lemma does not give that a plaquette P appears only once in the product, which would mean $a_P = b_P$. However:

Lemma 12. Suppose (for simplicity) that the boundary of each plaquette is positively oriented. If $\partial_v(M) = \partial(e) = \gamma_1 \partial(P_1)^{\theta_1} \gamma_1^{-1}\ \gamma_2 \partial(P_2)^{\theta_2} \gamma_2^{-1} \ldots \gamma_N \partial(P_N)^{\theta_N} \gamma_N^{-1}$, then given a plaquette P

$$\sum_{i:\ P_i = P} \theta_i = 1.$$

Proof. We consider the Hurewicz map between homotopy and homology long exact sequences (see e.g. [Hat02, Chapter 4]):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \pi_2(M, v) & \xrightarrow{i} & \pi_2(M, M^1, v) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \pi_1(M^1, v) & \xrightarrow{p} & \pi_1(M, v)\ . \\ \downarrow h & & \downarrow h_r & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow h \\ H_2(M) & \xrightarrow{i} & H_2(M, M^1) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & H_1(M^1) & \xrightarrow{p} & H_1(M) \end{array}$$

Since $\pi_2(M, v), \pi_1(M, v), H_2(M)$ and $H^2(M)$ are all trivial, this yields a commutative diagram with isomorphisms at rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_2(M, M^1, v) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\partial} & \pi_1(M^1, v)\ . \\ \downarrow h_r & & \downarrow h \\ H_2(M, M^1) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\partial} & H_1(M^1) \end{array}$$

Let $m = h(\partial(M)) \in H_1(M^1)$. The group $H_2(M, M^1)$ is the free abelian group on the plaquettes. Moreover $h_r(\gamma \triangleright P) = P$, for each plaquette P and each path γ connecting v to the base-point of P. The statement of the lemma follows from the observation that

$$\partial^{-1}(h\partial(M)) = \sum_{\text{plaquettes } P} P,$$

for we know *a priori* that: $\sum_{\text{plaquettes } P} \partial(P) = m.$ □

3.3 Evaluating fake-flat gauge configurations: a 2D notion of holonomy

3.3.1 Disk case

Cf. Porter-Turaev [PT05]. Let (M, L) be a 2-lattice. Let us suppose that M is topologically the oriented disk D^2. Consider a fake flat gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$ defined in (M, L). Choose a base-point v, to be a vertex of L. For simplicity it is assumed to be in the boundary of the oriented disk. As we saw in (3.2.2), there exists plaquettes $P_i, i = 1, \dots N$, where plaquettes might be repeated, integers $\theta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ (where $i = 1, \dots N$), and paths $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N$ in M^1, connecting v to the base point of each plaquette, such that (where consecutive pairs of a path and its inverse can be cancelled):

$$\partial_v(M) = \left(\gamma_1 \partial(P_1)^{\theta_1} \gamma_1^{-1}\right) \left(\gamma_2 \partial(P_2)^{\theta_2} \gamma_2^{-1}\right) \dots \left(\gamma_N \partial(P_N)^{\theta_N} \gamma_N^{-1}\right).$$

Definition 3.6. Let L, v be as above, and fix a crossed module $\mathcal{G} = (\partial_{\mathcal{G}} : E \to G, \triangleright)$. Considering (cf. Def.3.4) a fake flat gauge configuration, $\mathcal{F}$, the *evaluation* of it is the pair:

$$\mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathcal{F}, M) = \left(g_{\gamma_1} \triangleright e_{P_1}^{\theta_1}\ g_{\gamma_2} \triangleright e_{P_2}^{\theta_2}\ \dots\ g_{\gamma_m} \triangleright e_{P_m}^{\theta_m},\ g_{\partial(M)}\right) = \left(\mathrm{Hol}^2_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathcal{F}, M), \mathrm{Hol}^1_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathcal{F}, M)\right) \in E \rtimes G,$$

where $E \rtimes G$ denotes semi-direct product as in [Pfe03]. Here g_{γ_i} is the product of the elements of G assigned to the tracks making the path γ_i (or their inverses), and the same for $g_{\partial(M)}$. Note that, by construction:

$$\partial_{\mathcal{G}}\left(\mathrm{Hol}^2_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathcal{F}, M)\right) = \mathrm{Hol}^1_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathcal{F}, M). \tag{6}$$

Lemma 13. Fixing a vertex $v \subset \partial(M)$, the evaluation $\mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathcal{F})$ does not depend on any of the choices made.

Therefore we will consider $\mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathcal{F}, M)$ to be the formal 2D holonomy of the fake-flat gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$ on the 2-disk M, with initial point (or base-point) v.

Proof. A gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$ is an assignment of elements of G to the 1-cells of a CW-decomposition of M and elements of E to the 2-cells of it, satisfying the fake-flatness condition of figure 3. Whitehead's theorem (explained in 3.2.1) states that that the fundamental crossed module $\Pi_2(M, M^1, M^0)$, with set M^0 of base points - a crossed module of groupoids, is the free crossed module on the set of plaquettes over the free groupoid on the vertices and 1-tracks.

Given that the groupoid $\pi_1(M, M^0)$ is free, the assignment $\gamma \in L^1 \mapsto g_\gamma \in G$ uniquely extends to a groupoid map $\phi\colon \pi_1(M, M^0) \to G$. Now a gauge configuration also gives us a map $\psi_0\colon P \in L^2 \mapsto e_P$ from the set of plaquettes of L into E. The fake-flatness condition means that the outer part of the diagram below commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} L^2 & \xrightarrow{i} & \pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & E \\ & \searrow^{\partial_0} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \partial} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \partial_{\mathcal{G}}} \\ & & \pi_1(M^1, M^0) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & G \end{array} \quad \psi_0 : L^2 \to E .$$

And by applying the universal property defining free crossed modules of groupoids, we can see that a gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$ can be extended (uniquely) to a crossed module map $(\psi, \phi) = F\colon \Pi_2(M, M^1, M^0) \to \mathcal{G}$.

Now we make use of the proof of Lemma 10. Inside $\Pi_2(M, M^1, M^0)$, we can identify the boundary $\partial(M)$ of M, which lives in $\pi_1(M^1, v) \subset \pi_1(M^1, M^0)$. Given that $\pi_2(M^2, v)$ and $\pi_2(M^1, v)$ both are trivial, the long homotopy exact sequence of the based pair (M, M^1, v) proves that the boundary map $\partial\colon \pi_2(M, M^1, v) \to$

$\pi_1(M^1, v)$ is an isomorphism. In particular, given any two choices $\{\gamma_i, P_i\}$ and $\{\gamma'_i, P'_i\}$, of plaquettes and paths, as above, if:

$$\gamma_1 \partial(P_1)^{\theta_1} \gamma_1^{-1}\ \gamma_2 \partial(P_2)^{\theta_2} \gamma_2^{-1} \dots \gamma_m \partial(P_m)^{\theta_m} \gamma_m^{-1} = \gamma'_1 \partial(P'_1)^{\theta'_1} {\gamma'_1}^{-1}\ \gamma'_2 \partial(P'_2)^{\theta'_2} {\gamma'_2}^{-1} \dots \gamma'_m \partial(P'_m)^{\theta'_m} {\gamma'_m}^{-1},$$

since the left hand side is $\partial(\gamma_1 \triangleright P_1^{\theta_1}\ \gamma_2 \triangleright P_2^{\theta_2}\ \dots\ \gamma_m \triangleright P_m^{\theta_m})$, where we considered the product in $\pi_2(M^2, M^1, v)$, and the right hand side is $\partial(\gamma'_1 \triangleright P_1'^{\theta'_1}\ \gamma'_2 \triangleright P_2'^{\theta'_2}\ \dots\ \gamma'_m \triangleright P_m'^{\theta'_m})$, it follows that, in $\pi_2(M^2, M^1, v)$:

$$\gamma_1 \triangleright P_1^{\theta_1}\ \gamma_2 \triangleright P_2^{\theta_2}\ \dots\ \gamma_m \triangleright P_m^{\theta_m} = \gamma'_1 \triangleright P_1'^{\theta'_1}\ \gamma'_2 \triangleright P_2'^{\theta'_2}\ \dots\ \gamma'_m \triangleright P_m'^{\theta'_m}.$$

The gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$ gives a unique crossed module map $F = (\psi, \phi)\colon \Pi_2(M, M^1, M^0) \to \mathcal{G}$. Now note that the first bit of $\mathrm{Hol}_v(\mathcal{F}, M)$ is

$$g_{\gamma_1} \triangleright e_{P_1}^{\theta_1}\ g_{\gamma_2} \triangleright e_{P_2}^{\theta_2}\ \dots\ g_{\gamma_m} \triangleright e_{P_m}^{\theta_m} = \psi\left(\gamma_1 \triangleright P_1^{\theta_1}\ \gamma_2 \triangleright P_2^{\theta_2}\ \dots\ \gamma_m \triangleright P_m^{\theta_m}\right).$$

where, NB, on the left $\triangleright$ is in $\mathcal{G}$ and on the right $\triangleright$ is in Π_2; and the second is $\phi(\partial(M))$. Therefore neither depend on the choices made. □

Remark 14 (Dependence of base points)**.** The evaluation of gauge configurations depends explicitly on the choice of base point $v \in L^0$. However, the dependence is mild. Choose a path $v' \xrightarrow{\gamma} v$, in the boundary of the disk M, from the new base point v' to the initial base point v. Given that we did nothing more than changing the base point acting by γ we have that:

$$\mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}^{2'}(\mathcal{F}, M) = g_\gamma \triangleright \mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}^2(\mathcal{F}, M). \tag{7}$$

Explicitly, note that if

$$e_{v'} = \gamma \triangleright \left(\gamma_1 \triangleright P_1^{\theta_1}\ \gamma_2 \triangleright P_2^{\theta_2}\ \dots\ \gamma_m \triangleright P_m^{\theta_m}\right),$$

then $\partial(e_{v'})$ is the boundary $\partial(M)$ starting and ending in the vertex v', rather than v.

Note that (7) does not depend on the chosen path in $\partial(M)$ connecting v' and v. The reason is that if γ and γ' are paths connecting v' and v, then $\gamma^{-1}\gamma'$ is either $\partial(M)$ or its inverse, or it is trivially homotopic in $\partial(M)$. Suppose the former is true (the latter cases are analogous). Then

$$F(\gamma^{-1}\gamma') = g_{\partial_M} = \partial(\mathrm{Hol}_v^2(\mathcal{F}, M)).$$

Therefore, using the second Peiffer relation in the last step:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\gamma'} \triangleright \mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}^2(\mathcal{F}, M) &= g_\gamma \triangleright \left(g_\gamma^{-1} g_{\gamma'} \triangleright \mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}^2(\mathcal{F}, M)\right) \\ &= g_\gamma \triangleright \left(\partial(\mathrm{Hol}_v^2(\mathcal{F}, M)) \triangleright \mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}^2(\mathcal{F}, M)\right) \\ &= g_\gamma \triangleright \mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}^2(\mathcal{F}, M). \end{aligned}$$

3.3.2 The 2-sphere case

A crucial point in the proof of Lemma 13 is the fact that the kernel of the boundary map $\pi_2(M, M^1, v) \to \pi_1(M^1, v)$ is trivial if $M = D^2$. In general this does not hold (this kernel is isomorphic to $\pi_2(M, v)$). Therefore the evaluation of gauge configurations may not be well defined in general. The case of S^2, with a chosen orientation, is however also simple enough to be dealt with, since $\pi_2(S^2) \cong H_2(S^2) = \mathbb{Z}$.

Let M be topologically S^2. Consider a 2-lattice L whose underlying space is M. We make the following choices: (C1) a base point v in L^0. (C2) plaquettes $P_i,\ i = 1, \dots N$, possibly repeated; integers $\theta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ (where $i = 1, \dots N$); and paths $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N$ in M^1, connecting v to each $\beta_0(P_i)$, such that:

1. As usual considering that consecutive pairs of a path and its inverse can be cancelled:

$$\partial(M) = \left(\gamma_1 \partial(P_1)^{\theta_1} \gamma_1^{-1}\right)\ \left(\gamma_2 \partial(P_2)^{\theta_2} \gamma_2^{-1}\right) \dots \left(\gamma_N \partial(P_N)^{\theta_N} \gamma_N^{-1}\right),$$

2. The sum $\sum_i P_i$ spans the positive generator of $H_2(S^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.

That such P_i and γ_i exist follows from a discussion similar to the one in 3.2.2, now using the following map of exact sequences obtained from Hurewicz map between homotopy and homology long exact sequences, [Hat02]:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
\mathbb{Z} \cong \pi_2(M,v) & \xhookrightarrow{i} & \pi_2(M,M^1,v) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \pi_1(M^1,v) & \xrightarrow{p} & \pi_1(M,v) \cong \{1\}\,. \\
\cong\downarrow h & & \downarrow h_r & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow\cong \\
\mathbb{Z} \cong H_2(M) & \xhookrightarrow{i} & H_2(M,M^1) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & H_1(M^1) & \xrightarrow{p} & H_1(M) \cong \{0\}
\end{array}$$

Consider a fake flat gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$ in L. Then the evaluation $\mathrm{Hol}^2_v(\mathcal{F},M)$ of $\mathcal{F}$ is

$$\mathrm{Hol}^2_v(\mathcal{F},M) = g_{\gamma_1} \triangleright e^{\theta_1}_{P_1}\ g_{\gamma_2} \triangleright e^{\theta_2}_{P_2}\ \dots\ g_{\gamma_m} \triangleright e^{\theta_m}_{P_m} \in \ker\partial \subset E.$$

Lemma 15. The evaluation $\mathrm{Hol}^2_v(\mathcal{F},M)$ depends on the chosen base point (C1), but not on (C2).

Proof. As before, a gauge configuration is nothing more than a crossed module map $F\colon \Pi_2(M,M^1,M^0) \to \mathcal{G}$. By construction, given v in L^0, $\mathrm{Hol}^2_v(\mathcal{F})$ is $F(k)$, where (after considering the associated elements in $\pi_2(M,M^1,M^0)$):

$$k = \gamma_1 \triangleright P_1^{\theta_1}\ \gamma_2 \triangleright P_2^{\theta_2} \dots \gamma_m \triangleright P_m^{\theta_m}.$$

Clearly $k \in \pi_2(M,M^1,v)$ is such that $\partial(k) = 1$. Such element is fixed by the condition 2 above. □

Lemma 16. Let γ be a path in L^1 connecting v' to v, then:

$$\mathrm{Hol}^2_{v'}(\mathcal{F}) = g_\gamma \triangleright \mathrm{Hol}^2_v(\mathcal{F}).$$

If we invert the orientation of S^2 then the evaluation of the gauge configuration is the inverse of the former evaluation. We therefore identify $\mathrm{Hol}^2_v(\mathcal{F},M) \in E$ as the 2D holonomy along a 2-sphere with initial point v. This 2D holonomy does not depend on v up to acting by an element of G.

Proof. These are all trivial observations. Note that $g_\gamma \triangleright \mathrm{Hol}^2_{v'}(\mathcal{F})$ does not depend on the chosen path in M^1 connecting v' to v. Now the essential observation to prove so is the fact that if γ and γ' connect v and v' then they must be homotopic as paths. Therefore g_γ and $g_{\gamma'}$ project to the same elements of $\mathrm{coker}(\partial)$; recall that a gauge configuration is nothing more than a morphism $F\colon \Pi_2(M^2,M^1,M^0) \to \mathcal{G}$. Now note that by the second Peiffer condition, the action of an element $g \in G$ on $\ker(\partial)$ depends only on its projection onto $\mathrm{coker}(\partial)$. □

Example 17. Consider the CW-decomposition L_0 of the 2-sphere with a single 0-cell and a 2-cell, inducing the positive orientation of S^2; c.f. example 4. A gauge configuration is simply an element $m \in E$ colouring its unique 2-cell. Fake-flateness imposes $m \in \ker(\partial)$. The 2D holonomy of such gauge configuration is m

Example 18. Consider the CW-decomposition of the 2-sphere, with two zero cells, at the north v_N and south pole v_S, four one cells, all connecting v_S with v_N, and the obvious four 2-cells. (Imagine the surface of a peeled orange, with four orange buds.) Then $\mathrm{Hol}^2_{v_S}(\mathcal{F}) = dcba \in \ker(\partial) \subset E$; see figure 4. Note that this does not depend on the 2-cell we start from. This is because $\partial(dcba) = 1_G$, thus $dcba$ is central, and:

$$dcba = d^{-1}dcbad = cbad$$



$$\begin{cases} \partial(d) = XW^{-1} \\ \partial(c) = WZ^{-1} \\ \partial(b) = ZY^{-1} \\ \partial(a) = YX^{-1} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathrm{Hol}^2_{v_S}(\mathcal{F}) = dcba$$

Figure 4: A gauge configuration based on the 2-sphere. Note that the equator is marked, but it is not part of any 1-cell. All tracks, here coloured by $X, Y, Z, W \in G$, are oriented from south to north. All 2-cells, here coloured by $a, b, c, d \in E$, attach counterclockwise, using the right hand law where the thumb is pointing outwards, and are based at the south pole. The 2-cell d is on the back of the 2-sphere.

Example 19. Consider the CW-decomposition of the 2-disk shown in Figure 5. All circles are oriented counterclockwise. Given a gauge configuration as in the figure, its 2D holonomy based in the v vertex located in the outer circle is $f(Z^{-1} \triangleright e)$.



$$\begin{cases} \partial(e) = X \\ \partial(f) = Y Z^{-1} X^{-1} Z \end{cases}$$

$$\partial(f)\partial(Z^{-1} \triangleright e) = Y$$

$$\mathrm{Hol}_v^2(\mathcal{F}) = f\left(Z^{-1} \triangleright e\right)$$

Figure 5: A gauge configuration based on the 2-disk.

3.4 2-flat gauge configurations

The material of this subsection will only be used when proving in §5.2 that the dimension of ground state of higher lattice gauge theory is independent of the lattice decomposition of a manifold, and in particular it is a topological invariant.

Definition 3.7 (2-flat configuration)**.** Let $\mathcal{G} = (\partial\colon E \to G, \triangleright)$ be a crossed module. Consider a fake flat gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$ based on a 2-lattice (M, L). The boundary $\partial(b)$ of each blob b inherits a 2-lattice structure and a fake flat gauge configuration. The gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be 2-flat if for every blob b, we have:

$$\mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}^2(\mathcal{F}, \partial(\mathrm{b})) = 1_E.$$

NB: With respect to reference points and orientation, required for defining the holonomy, note that each blob b has an assigned base-point in the boundary $\partial(b)$ and an orientation of $\partial(b)$. Nevertheless, the condition $\mathrm{Hol}_{\mathrm{v}}^2(\mathcal{F}, \partial(\mathrm{b})) = 1_E$ is independent of the choice of base-point and orientation by Lemma 15.

Example: The fake-flat configuration Ω_1 from §3.2 (the naive vacuum) is 2-flat.

Theorem 20. We have a one-to-one correspondence between flat gauge configurations and crossed module maps $f\colon \Pi_2(M, M^1, M^0) \to \mathcal{G}$.

Proof. We resume the notation of 3.2.1. Recall the statement of Whitehead theorem 8, stating that $\Pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0)$ is the free crossed module over $\pi_1(M^1, M^0)$ on the attaching maps of the 2-cells. Let us explain how to relate $\Pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0)$ to $\Pi_2(M^3, M^1, M^0)$, where we now attach the 3-cells (blobs) to M^2, yielding M^3. (Any attached cells of dimension strictly greater than 3 will not affect the underlying crossed module, therefore $\Pi_2(M, M^1, M^0) = \Pi_2(M^3, M^1, M^0)$.). Each 3-cell will induce a relation between elements of $\pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0)$. Let $b \in L^3$ be a blob. The boundary $\partial(b)$ is a pointed 2-sphere embebbed in M^2, with base-point $v_b = \beta(P)$ and moreover it is a subcomplex of M^2 (the latter is only useful for visualisation purposes). Therefore a blob b yields an element $\partial(b) \in \pi_2(M^2, M^1, v_b)$.

To pass from $\pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0)$ to $\pi_2(M^3, M^1, M^0) = \pi_2(M, M^1, M^0)$ we solely need to impose that $\partial(b)$ vanishes (i.e that it is the trivial homotopy class in $\pi_2(M, M^1, M^0)$) for each blob b. The statement of the theorem therefore follows the fact that a crossed module map $f\colon \Pi_2(M^2, M^1, M^0) \to \mathcal{G}$ descends to a crossed module map $f\colon \Pi_2(M^3, M^1, M^0) \to \mathcal{G}$ if and only if $f(\partial(b)) = 1_E$ for each blob b.

There are several possible ways to prove the latter intuitive and geometrically evident statement. We can directly see it from the long homotopy exact sequence of the triple (M, M^2, M^1), together with the fact that the groupoid $\pi_3(M^3, M^2, M^0)$ is the free $\pi_1(M^1, M^0)$-module on the blobs; [Hat02]. (Details are in [Far09]) Alternatively it follows from the higher-dimensional van Kampen theorem of Brown and Higgins; see [BH81a, BHS11]. Using it, it follows that the diagram below is a pushout in the category of crossed

modules of groupoids.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigsqcup_{b\in L^3} \Pi_2(S^2,*,*) & \xrightarrow{p_1} & \bigsqcup_{b\in L^3} \Pi_2(D^3,*,*)\ . \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle i_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle i_2} \\ \Pi_2(M^2,M^1,M^0) & \xrightarrow{p_2} & \Pi_2(M,M^1,M^0) \end{array}$$

Let us clarify: the underlying groupoid of $\bigsqcup_{b\in L^3}\Pi_2(S^2,*,*)$ is a totally transitive groupoid with one object for each $b\in L^3$ and only identity maps. At each 3-cell b, the top group of the crossed module $\bigsqcup_{b\in L^3}\Pi_2(S^2,*,*)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. The groupoid $\bigsqcup_{b\in L^3}\Pi_2(D^3,*,*)$ has an object for each blob b and only identity morphisms (at all levels). There exists a unique groupoid map p_1 which is the identity on objects. The groupoid map i_1 is induced by the inclusion of the blobs boundary in M^2 and analogously for i_2 which is induced by the inclusion of the blobs into M. And finally p_2 is induced by the inclusion. □

4 Gauge transformations

4.1 The group $\mathcal{T}$ of gauge operators

Given a group G and a set S write G^S for the group that is $\hom(S,G)$ with pointwise product (the direct product group with factors G indexed by S).

Consider a 2-lattice L based in the manifold M. Let $\mathcal{G}=(\partial\colon E\to G,\triangleright)$ be a group crossed module.

Definition 4.1 (The group $\mathcal{T}(M,L,\mathcal{G})$ of gauge operators)**.** There is a left-action $\bullet$ of $\mathcal{V}(M,L,\mathcal{G})=G^{L^0}$ on $\mathcal{E}(M,L,\mathcal{G})=E^{L^1}$ by automorphisms. Given $\eta\in\mathcal{E}(M,L,\mathcal{G})$ and $u\in\mathcal{V}(M,L,\mathcal{G})$, the action $\bullet$ has the form:

$$(u\bullet\eta)\left(\sigma(t)\xrightarrow{t}\tau(t)\right)=u\big(\sigma(t)\big)\triangleright\left(\eta\left(\sigma(t)\xrightarrow{t}\tau(t)\right)\right). \tag{8}$$

The group $\mathcal{T}(M,L,\mathcal{G})$ of gauge operators is defined as being the semidirect product:

$$\mathcal{T}(M,L,\mathcal{G})\ =\ \mathcal{E}(M,L,\mathcal{G})\rtimes_\bullet\mathcal{V}(M,L,\mathcal{G})\ =\ E^{L^1}\rtimes_\bullet G^{L^0}. \tag{9}$$

In particular we take $(\eta,u)(\eta',u')\ =\ \big(\eta\,u\bullet\eta',u\,u'\big)$.

Example 21. Let Σ_n denote the symmetric group. Recall $L_{\mathfrak{g}}$ from example 4 and $\mathcal{G}_{32}$ from example 1. Then $\mathcal{T}(S^3,L_{\mathfrak{g}},\mathcal{G}_{32})=\Sigma_3$.

This group acts on gauge configuration, in a way such that 2D holonomy is preserved. In order to present the action, we now define a double category $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G})$ out of the crossed module $\mathcal{G}$; see [BHS11, BH81b].

4.2 The double category $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G})$

The definition of a double category appears in [BHS11]. Here we should think of a double category (with one object) as a set of 1-squares — labelled arrows that can always be concatenated; and 2-squares (squares whose four sides are each part of the set of 1-squares) that compose vertically and horizontally whenever sides match. These compositions are to be associative and a compatibility condition between horizontal and vertical compositions is imposed: the interchange law. Therefore a grid filled with squares of a double category has a well defined composition.

Fix $\mathcal{G}=(\partial\colon E\to G,\triangleright)$. The set $\mathcal{D}^1(\mathcal{G})$ of 1-squares is the set G, with G-product as composition. These 1-squares should be seen [FP11] as arrows like $*\xrightarrow{X}*$, where $X\in G$. Thus the concatenation is:

$$*\xrightarrow{X}*\xrightarrow{Y}=*\xrightarrow{XY}*.$$

The set $\mathcal{D}^2(\mathcal{G})$ of 2-squares consists of squares of the form below:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} * & \xrightarrow{W} & * \\ {\scriptstyle Z}\uparrow & e & \uparrow{\scriptstyle Y} \\ * & \xrightarrow[X]{} & * \end{array} \qquad \text{where } X,Y,Z,W\in G \text{ and } e\in E \text{ are such that } \partial(e)^{-1}XY=ZW \tag{10}$$

(Thus squares in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G})$ are fake-flat gauge configurations colouring the obvious 2-lattice structure on the square.) Horizontal and vertical compositions can be performed when squares match on the relevant sides:



These compositions are associative and satisfy the interchange law, which says that the composition of:



does not depend on the order whereby it is done. To prove the interchange law, only, we will need to make explicit use of the second Peiffer condition.

Definition 4.2. Let D_4 denote the dihedral group of symmetries of the square. Let $\rho_{\pi/2} \in D_4$ denote anticlockwise rotation by 90 degrees, and r_x, r_y, r_{xy} denote reflection in the $y = 0$, $x = 0$ and $x = y$ axis.

The set $\mathcal{D}^2(\mathcal{G})$ of 2-squares is a D_4-space. Under the action of the above elements of D_4, the square (10) is transformed into, respectively:



The middle two squares are (respectively) called the vertical and horizontal reverses of the square (10). Each element of D_4 acts on $\mathcal{D}^2(\mathcal{G})$ by automorphisms, though sometimes permuting the horizontal and vertical multiplications, and / or the order of multiplications (antiautomorphism).

4.3 Full gauge transformations between higher gauge configurations

The action of the group $\mathcal{T}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ on the set $\Phi(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ is given in §4.4. We first need some technicalities.

Definition 4.3 (Full gauge transformation)**.** A full gauge transformation U starting in the gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$, is a map $U : L^1 \to \mathcal{D}^2(\mathcal{G})$ such that (recall that L^1 is the set of tracks):

- whenever two tracks share a vertex the corresponding sides of the squares match (recall edges are oriented),
- the top colour of each $U(t)$ coincides with $\mathcal{F}(t)$.

A full gauge transformation U, starting in $\mathcal{F}$, 'transforms' the configuration $\mathcal{F}$ into another one, here denoted $U \triangleright \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}'$, in the following sense. At the level of edge colourings, if t is a track then $(U \triangleright \mathcal{F})(t) = \mathcal{F}'(t)$

is the bottom colour of the square $U(t)$. At the level of plaquettes it is more complicated. We give this next (paying attention also to the preservation of fake-flatness).

We refer to figure 6 below. It depicts a cylinder whose top is made out of a plaquette P (and its boundary) in L, coloured by $\mathcal{F}$. The sides of the cylinder consist of appropriate squares of the full gauge transformation U (only vertex colourings appear in the figure). Finally the bottom of the cylinder is a copy of the plaquette P, now coloured with $U \triangleright \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}'$. And then the 'gauge-transformed' colour e'_P of the plaquette P, where P is based at v, is the 2D holonomy, based at v' of the disk consisting of the top and sides of the cylinder in figure 6. Note that this has an inherent fake-flat colouring obtained by putting U and $\mathcal{F}$ together. By lemma 13 the 2D holonomy of this disk is well defined (independent of the way faces are composed). Also by (6) fake-flatness is preserved.



Figure 6: Full gauge transformations in the vicinity of a plaquette.

If U is a full gauge transformation starting at $\mathcal{F}$ and transforming $\mathcal{F}$ into $\mathcal{F}' = U \triangleright \mathcal{F}$ we will put:

$$\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{U} \mathcal{F}'.$$

Lemma 22. If we have a sequence of full gauge transformations $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{U} \mathcal{F}' \xrightarrow{U'} \mathcal{F}''$, then the full gauge transformation $U' * U$, starting in $\mathcal{F}$, and whose underlying squares are obtained by vertically composing the underlying squares in $\mathcal{G}$ of U and U', connects $\mathcal{F}$ to $\mathcal{F}''$; i.e. $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{U'*U} \mathcal{F}''$.

Proof. Cf. figure 6. Put the squares of the full gauge transformation U' on the bottom of the ones of U. There are two different ways to compose all top and lateral faces, both yield the same 2D holonomoy for the disk made out of the top and lateral sides of the cylinder. a) Either we firstly multiply the squares standing on top of each other, and then compose with the top disk, and in this case the colour of the bottom disk will be $\big((U' * U) \triangleright (\mathcal{F})\big)(P)$. Or b) compose U with $\mathcal{F}$ and only after that compose with U'; and then the colour of the bottom disk will be $\big(U' \triangleright (U \triangleright \mathcal{F})\big)(P)$. □

By using the vertical reverse of squares in Defn.4.2 we conclude that gauge transformations can be reversed. Therefore:

Theorem 23 (The groupoid $\Phi^\sharp(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ of gauge configurations and full gauge transformations)**.** Let (M, L) be a 2-lattice. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a crossed module. We have a groupoid $\Phi^\sharp(M, L, \mathcal{G}) = \Phi^\sharp(M, L)$, whose objects are the fake-flat gauge configurations $\mathcal{F} \in \Phi(M, L, \mathcal{G})$, and whose morphisms are the full gauge transformations $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{U} \mathcal{F}'$ between gauge configurations. □

Remark 24. NB: The groupoid $\Phi^\sharp(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ is part of a more general construction: by considering 2-fold homotopies between gauge transformations [BHS11] (note that very different terminology is used there), we actually get a 2-groupoid; see (in an algebraic topology language) [FMP07, Far07] or (in a language closer to this paper) [FP11, BS07, SW11]. 2-gauge transformations (to be 2-fold homotopies) between gauge

transformations, do not appear to have large importance for this paper. However they have prime importance for addressing algebraic topology description of higher gauge theory invariants of manifolds (Yetter invariant [Yet93, Por99]) as explained in [FMP07, Far07].

Full gauge transformations preserve 2D holonomy, as discussed in [FP11]. We will state the result for a 2-sphere (whose behaviour under full gauge transformations is the neatest).

Theorem 25. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a gauge configuration in the 2-sphere S^2, with a certain 2-lattice decomposition L. Choose a vertex $v \in L^0$. Choose also a full gauge transformation U starting at $\mathcal{F}$. Let $U(v)$ be the element of G associated to v; cf. (11). The following holds.

$$\mathrm{Hol}^2_v(U \triangleright \mathcal{F}, S^2) \;=\; U(v) \triangleright \mathrm{Hol}^2_v(\mathcal{F}, S^2).$$

Proof. Let the original gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$ be $L^1 \ni t \mapsto g_t \in G$ and $P \in L^2 \mapsto e_P$. Let the new gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}' = U \triangleright F$ be $t \in L^1 \mapsto g'_t \in G$ and $P \in L^2 \mapsto e'_P$.

We can consider a modified (thickened) 2-lattice decomposition of the 2-sphere where each edge t is thickened to a rectangle, with a line passing through it, and each n-valent vertex v is thickened to a triangulated region bounded by a polygon with n edges; see figure below to see what happens to a trivalent vertex.



Figure 7: The thickening of a combinatorial cell decomposition of the 2-sphere close to a tri-valent vertex

The gauge transformation U, and the initial fake-flat gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$, can together be assembled into a fake-flat colouring $\mathcal{M}$ of the 2-sphere, where the latter is given this thickened cell decomposition. All new faces coming from edges are coloured by squares of the full gauge transformation, or its vertical inverses. All new faces coming from vertices of the original cell decompositions have the sides coloured by the restriction of the gauge transformations, but the inherent colouring by an element of E is to be trivial - all faces and edges inside the inner triangle in figure 7 are to be trivially coloured. Close to the vertex v this would look more or less like the pattern shown in the figure below (trivial colourings are not made explicit).



Figure 8: The gauge configuration close to the vertex v; here $g = U(v)$. Be aware that we must rotate (Remark 4.2) each square $U(t)$, $U(t')$ and $U(t'')$ in order that it fits inside the diagram.

Now recall that the evaluation of gauge configuration on the sphere, with a base point, does not depend on the particular way we choose to evaluate it; Lemma 15. We can evaluate $\mathrm{Hol}^2_v(\mathcal{F}', S^2)$ in two different ways. We can either cancel out all pair of a square $U(t)$, where t is an arbitrary track, and its vertical reverse, and then the end result is $U(v) \triangleright \mathrm{Hol}^2_v(\mathcal{F}, S^2)$. Or we could combine the plaquettes with the $U(t)$ elements which would give us $\mathrm{Hol}^2_v(U \triangleright \mathcal{F}, S^2)$, by construction of full gauge transformations. □

4.4 The action of the group of gauge operators on gauge configurations

Now for the action of the group $\mathcal{T}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ on the set $\Phi(M, L, \mathcal{G})$. The idea is to consider a group action whose action-groupoid is the groupoid $\Phi^\sharp(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ of gauge configurations and full gauge transformations between them, from theorem 23.

Given a gauge configuration $\mathcal{F}$, the set of full gauge transformations starting in $\mathcal{F}$ can be put in one-to-one correspondence with elements $(\eta, u) \in \mathcal{T}(M, L, \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{E}(M, L, \mathcal{G}) \rtimes_\bullet \mathcal{V}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$. At a track $v \xrightarrow{t} v'$, our convention for such correspondence $(\eta, u, \mathcal{F}) \mapsto U = U_{(\eta,u,\mathcal{F})}$ is:

$$\Big(v \xrightarrow{t} v'\Big) \longmapsto \quad \begin{pmatrix} * & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}(t)} & * \\ {\scriptstyle u(v)}\uparrow & \eta(t) & \uparrow{\scriptstyle u(v')} \\ * & \xrightarrow[U \triangleright \mathcal{F}(t)]{} & * \end{pmatrix}; \quad \text{where: } U \triangleright \mathcal{F}(t) = \partial\big(\eta(t)\big)\, u(v)\, \mathcal{F}(t)\, u(v')^{-1}. \tag{11}$$

The operation of the group $\mathcal{T}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ on $\Phi(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ is then defined by:

$$(\eta, u)\mathcal{F} \;=\; U_{(\eta,u,\mathcal{F})} \triangleright \mathcal{F}, \tag{12}$$

where recall that $U_{(\eta,u,\mathcal{F})} \triangleright \mathcal{F}$ is the target of the morphism $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{U_{(\eta,u,\mathcal{F})}} U_{(\eta,u,\mathcal{F})} \triangleright \mathcal{F}$ in $\Phi^\sharp(M, L, \mathcal{G})$.

By construction, cf. Lemma 22, this is indeed a left-action of $\mathcal{T}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ on $\Phi(M, L, \mathcal{G})$.

5 The Hamiltonian models

5.1 A Hamiltonian model for higher gauge theory

Let M be a manifold, possibly with boundary. Let (M, L) be a 2-lattice. Let $\mathcal{G} = (\partial\colon E \to G, \triangleright)$ be a crossed module of groups. Recall from §4.1 the group $\mathcal{T}(M, L, \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{E}(M, L, \mathcal{G}) \rtimes_\bullet \mathcal{V}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ of gauge operators. We have a left-action of the group of gauge operators on the set $\Phi(M, L, \mathcal{G})$, preserving 2D holonomy in the sense of theorem 25.

Definition 5.1 (Gauge spikes)**.** A vertex gauge spike, supported in $v \in L^0$ is a gauge operator (η, u) such that $\eta(t) = 1_E$ for each $t \in L^1$ and such that $u(w) = 1_G$, unless $w = v$. Analogously, given a track $t \in L^1$, a gauge spike supported in t is a gauge operator (η, u) such that $u(v) = 1_G$ for each $v \in L^0$ and $\eta(s) = 1_E$ unless $s = t$. Given a vertex v and $g \in G$ we let U_v^g be the unique vertex spike supported in v such that $u(v) = g$. Given a track t and $e \in E$ we let U_t^e be the unique edge spike such that $\eta(t) = e$.

As a bridge with the double category formulation in (11), spike algebra can be drawn schematically by restricting to a neighbourhood of the support as follows:

$U_v^a =$ 

, $U_t^\alpha =$ 

,

$U_v^a U_v^b =$ 

$U_t^\alpha U_v^a =$ 

,

$U_v^a U_t^\alpha =$ 

Lemma 26. (I) Vertex gauge spikes supported in different vertices commute. (II) Edge gauge spikes supported in different edges commute. (III) Vertex and edge spikes with non-touching support (in the obvious sense) commute. (IV) Given a vertex v, a track $t = \sigma(t) \xrightarrow{t} \tau(t)$ and $g \in G$ and $e \in E$, we have:

$$U_v^g U_v^h = U_v^{gh}\,, \qquad U_t^e U_t^f = U_t^{ef}$$
$$U_t^e U_{\tau(t)}^g = U_{\tau(t)}^g U_t^e\,, \qquad U_t^e U_{\sigma(t)}^g = U_{\sigma(t)}^g U_t^{g^{-1} \triangleright e}.$$

(V) Any gauge operator can be obtained as a product of vertex and edge gauge spikes.

Proof. The only non-elementary point is commutation of $U_{\sigma(t)}^g$ and U_t^e. But this follows from the definition of the group of gauge operators as a semidirect product and the defining automorphism (8). □

In the group algebra $\mathbb{C}\mathcal{T}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ define

$$A_v \doteq \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} U_v^g, \qquad B_t \doteq \frac{1}{\#E} \sum_{e \in E} U_t^e \tag{13}$$

From lemma 26 we have the following.

Lemma 27. Given arbitrary vertices u and v and tracks s and t we have:

$$A_v A_v = A_v, \qquad B_t B_t = B_t$$
$$[A_v, A_u] = 0 \qquad [A_v, B_t] = 0 \qquad [B_t, B_s] = 0$$

□

The free vector space on the set of (as usual fake-flat) gauge configurations is denoted

$$\mathcal{H}(M, L, \mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{C}\Phi(M, L, \mathcal{G}).$$

We sometimes write this as $\mathcal{H}(M, L)$, $\mathcal{H}(M)$ or $\mathcal{H}$. Note that fake-flatness is imposed from the beginning, but 2-flatness (Definition 3.7) is not.

The algebra $\mathbb{C}\mathcal{T}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ acts in the obvious way on $\mathcal{H}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$. That is, given $\mathcal{F} \in \Phi(M, L, \mathcal{G})$,

$$A_v(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{\text{vertex gauge spikes } u \text{ supported in } v} u \triangleright \mathcal{F}$$

$$B_t(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{1}{\#E} \sum_{\text{edge gauge spikes } \eta \text{ supported in } t} \eta \triangleright \mathcal{F}$$

Let $b \in L^3$ and $e \in E$. The diagonal idempotent blob operator $C_b^e \in \mathrm{E}nd(\mathcal{H})$ is given by

$$C_b^e(\mathcal{F}) = \delta\Big(\mathrm{Hol}_{\beta_0(b)}\big(\mathcal{F}, \partial(b)\big), e\Big)\mathcal{F}.$$

Given the invariance of the 2D holonomy under gauge transformations (theorem 25 has the S^2 case, which is sufficient here, cf. Porter–Turaev [PT05])):

Lemma 28. Blob operators commute with edge gauge spikes on $\mathcal{H}$. Vertex gauge spikes not based at the base point of a blob commute with the inherent blob operator. If v is the base point $\beta_0(b)$ of b then:

$$C_b^e \circ U_v^g(\mathcal{F}) = U_v^g \circ C_b^{g^{-1} \triangleright e}(\mathcal{F}).$$

□

Definition 5.2 (Higher Kitaev model)**.** Let (M, L) be a 2-lattice. Let $\mathcal{G} = (\partial\colon E \to G, \triangleright)$ be a crossed module of groups. Our proposal for a higher gauge theory Hamiltonian

$$H_L = H\colon \mathcal{H}(M, L, \mathcal{G}) \to \mathcal{H}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$$

with respect to the 2-lattice (M, L) is:

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \sum_{v \in L^0} (\mathrm{id} - A_v) + \sum_{t \in L^1} (\mathrm{id} - B_t) + \sum_{b \in L^2} \big(\mathrm{id} - C_b^{1_E}\big) \\ &= \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The commutation relations between vertex, track and blob operators shown in lemmas 26, 27 and 28, guarantee that

$$[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}] = 0, \qquad [\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}] = 0 \qquad [\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}] = 0.$$

And moreover we have that:

$$\mathcal{A}^2 = \mathcal{A}, \qquad \mathcal{B}^2 = \mathcal{B} \qquad \mathcal{C}^2 = \mathcal{C}.$$

Consider the inner product $\langle -, - \rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ that renders different configurations orthogonal and normalised. A quick calculation shows that the all blob operators and all vertex and gauge spikes are Hermitian (self-adjoint). Therefore $H\colon \mathcal{H}(M, L, \mathcal{G}) \to \mathcal{H}(M, L, \mathcal{G})$ is Hermitian.

Note that edge and vertex gauge spikes, which implement gauge invariance at vertices and tracks of a 2-lattice, and the blob operators, which enforce 2-flatness at a blob, are very different in nature.

Lemma 29. Let (M, L) be a 2-lattice. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a crossed module. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a gauge configuration. Let

$$\zeta(\mathcal{F}) = \zeta_L(\mathcal{F}) = \#\{b \in L^3 : \mathrm{Hol}_v\big(\mathcal{F}, \partial(b)\big) \neq 1_E\}.$$

Then $\zeta(\mathcal{F})$ is invariant under full gauge transformations and in particular it is invariant under vertex and edge gauge transformations. Moreover $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}) = \zeta(\mathcal{F})\mathcal{F}$ for each gauge configuration $\mathcal{F} \in H(M, L, \mathcal{G})$. □

5.2 Ground state degeneracy

In this subsection we will prove that the dimension of the ground state space of higher lattice gauge theory is a topological invariant. Specifically, let (M, L) be a 2-lattice. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a finite crossed module. We will prove that even though the Hibert space $\mathcal{H}(M, L, \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{H}(M, L)$ of lattice higher gauge theory explicitly depends on the lattice decomposition of M, the dimension of the ground state space $GS(M, L)$ of $H_L\colon \mathcal{H}(M, L) \to \mathcal{H}(M, L)$ depends only on the topology of the underlying manifold M, being equal to the cardinality of the set of homotopy classes of maps from M to the classifying space of the crossed module $\mathcal{G}$. From this it will follow that the dimension of the ground state $GS(M, L)$ is a homotopy invariant, as expected given the

relation of our model [BCK$^+$16] to Yetter's invariant of manifolds [Yet93, Por99]. The latter was proven in [FMP07, Far07] to be a homotopy invariant.

Let us start by looking at the expression (14) for H_L:

$$H_L = \sum_{v\in L^0} (\mathrm{id} - A_v) + \sum_{t\in L^1} (\mathrm{id} - B_t) + \sum_{b\in L^2} \left(\mathrm{id} - C_b^{1_E}\right)$$

Each of the operators $\mathrm{id} - A_v$, where $v \in L^0$ is a vertex; $\mathrm{id} - B_t$, where $t \in L^1$ is a track; and $\mathrm{id} - C_b$, where $b \in L^2$ is a blob, is a Hermitian projector. All of those projectors commute. Thus we can choose an eigenspace decomposition $\mathcal{H}(M, L) = \sum_i^{\perp} \mathcal{H}_i(M, L)$ where all those projectors are diagonal.

Note that if we apply A_v or B_t to any configuration $\mathcal{F}$ we get a non-zero linear combination with non-negative coefficients. Let us write $\mathcal{H}^+$ for the subset of non-zero $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$-linear combinations in $\mathcal{H}$. Since A_v and B_t both take an $\mathcal{F}$ to an element of $\mathcal{H}^+$, and indeed take an element of $\mathcal{H}^+$ to an element of $\mathcal{H}^+$, we have that $\Psi_0 = \prod_v A_v \prod_t B_t \Omega_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ is non-zero. Since $C_b\Omega_1 = \Omega_1$ it follows that there is an H-eigenspace of $\mathcal{H}$ (containing Ψ_0) with eigenvalue 0. Recall the naive vacuum Ω_1 is given by $\mathcal{F}(x) = 1$ for all cells x.

Now projectors have eigenvalues 0 or 1, thus the ground state has energy zero, and in order for a vector to belong to the ground state $GS(M, L)$ it must be in the kernel of all of the projectors $\mathrm{id} - A_v$, $\mathrm{id} - B_t$ and $\mathrm{id} - C_b$, where $v \in L^0$, $t \in L^1$ and $b \in L^2$.

Lemma 30. A state $\Psi = \sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\Phi(M,L)} \lambda_{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{H}(M, L)$, where $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathbb{C}$, belongs to the ground state space if and only if:

(i) unless $\mathcal{F}$ is 2-flat then $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$; see Definition 3.7 for the definition of a 2-flat configuration;

(ii) given any $g \in G$, any vertex $v \in L^0$ and any $\mathcal{F} \in \Phi(M, L)$ it holds $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} = \lambda_{U_v^g\mathcal{F}}$;

(iii) given any $e \in E$, any track $t \in L^1$ and any $\mathcal{F} \in \Phi(M, L)$ it holds $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} = \lambda_{U_t^e\mathcal{F}}$.

Proof. First the 'only if' part. We require (i) $\mathcal{C}_b(\Psi) = \Psi$; (ii) $A_v\Psi = \Psi$; and (iii) $B_t\Psi = \Psi$.

(i) For each $b \in L^3$, $\mathcal{C}_b(\Psi) = \sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\Phi(M,L)} \lambda_{\mathcal{F}}\delta\Big(\mathrm{Hol}_v\big(\mathcal{F}, \partial(b)\big), 1_E\Big)\mathcal{F}$. In order that $\mathcal{C}_b(\Psi) = \Psi$, it must be that $\delta\Big(\mathrm{Hol}_v\big(\mathcal{F}, \partial(b)\big), 1_E\Big) = 1$ for each blob b, whenever $\lambda_F \neq 0$.

(ii) Suppose that $A_v(\Psi) = \Psi$, for all $v \in L^0$. Then:

$$\Psi = \sum_{\mathcal{F}'\in\Phi(M,L)} \lambda_{\mathcal{F}'}\mathcal{F}' = A_v(\Psi) \; = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{\mathcal{F}'\in\Phi(M,L)} \Big(\sum_{h\in G} \lambda_{\mathcal{F}'} U_v^h \mathcal{F}'\Big)$$

Now apply $\langle \mathcal{F}, - \rangle$. And since $U_v^{gh}\mathcal{F} = U_v^g\big(U_v^h\mathcal{F}\big)$ we have for each $v \in L^0$ and any $g \in G$:

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{h\in G} \lambda_{U_v^{h^{-1}}\mathcal{F}} = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{h\in G} \lambda_{U_v^{h^{-1}}U_v^g\mathcal{F}} = \lambda_{U_v^g\mathcal{F}}.$$

(iii) Analogously, it order that Ψ be in the kernel of all $(\mathrm{id} - B_t)$, then $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} = \lambda_{U_t^e\mathcal{F}}$.

Conversely if Ψ satisfies $(i), (ii)$ and (iii) then it will be in the kernel of all operators $\mathrm{id} - A_v$, $\mathrm{id} - B_t$ and $\mathrm{id} - C_b$, where $v \in L^0, t \in L^1$ and $b \in L^2$, thus Ψ will be in the ground state. □

Let $\overset{\text{flat}}{\Phi}(M, L)$ be the set of 2-flat and fake-flat configurations. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ in $\overset{\text{flat}}{\Phi}(M, L)$ are equivalent ($\mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{F}'$) if we can go from $\mathcal{F}$ to $\mathcal{F}'$ by a sequence of vertex and edge gauge spikes. In order that $\Psi = \sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\overset{\text{flat}}{\Phi}(M,L)} \lambda_{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{F} \in GS(M, L)$ it is necessary and sufficient that if $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{F}'$ then $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} = \lambda_{\mathcal{F}'}$.

The composite of gauge spikes is a full gauge transformation and, Lem.26(V), any full gauge transformation is the composition of gauge spikes. Thus to say that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ in $\overset{\text{flat}}{\Phi}(M, L)$ are equivalent is to say that they are connected by a full gauge transformation.

The groupoid $\Phi^\sharp(M,L)$ of gauge configurations and gauge transformations (Theorem 23) has a full subgroupoid $\overset{\text{flat}\,\sharp}{\Phi}(M,L)$ whose objects are the 2-flat gauge configurations. (And recall that 2-flat gauge configurations are in one-to-one correspondence with crossed module maps $\Pi_2(M,M^1,M^0)\to\mathcal{G}$; see Theorem 20.) Let

$$\pi_0\big(\overset{\text{flat}\,\sharp}{\Phi}(M,L)\big)$$

be the set of equivalence classes of objects of $\overset{\text{flat}\,\sharp}{\Phi}(M,L)$, where two 2-flat and fake-flat configurations are equivalent if one morphism (i.e. a full gauge transformation) connects the two. We thus have a basis for the ground space $GS(M,L)$ which is:

$$\mathsf{B}_0(M,L)=\Big\{\sum_{\mathcal{F}\cong\mathcal{F}'}\mathcal{F}\quad\Big|\mathcal{F}'\in\pi_0\big(\overset{\text{flat}\,\sharp}{\Phi}(M,L)\big)\Big\}. \tag{15}$$

As explained in [BH91, Thm.A, p.104] or [BHS11] (in the general case of crossed complexes), a crossed module $\mathcal{G}$ has a classifying space $B_\mathcal{G}$. As proven in loc. cit. there is a natural bijection between elements of $\pi_0\big(\overset{\text{flat}\,\sharp}{\Phi}(M,L)\big)$ and homotopy classes of maps $M\to B_\mathcal{G}$. (For an explanation in the crossed module case see [FMP07, Far07].) In particular the size of $\overset{\text{flat}}{\Phi}(M,L)$ does not depend on L. In fact:

Theorem 31. Let M be a compact manifold. Let L be a lattice decomposition M. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a finite crossed module. Consider the Hamiltonian $H_L\colon\mathcal{H}(M,L)\to\mathcal{H}(M,L)$ of Definition 5.2. Then the ground state of H_L (which in our normalisation has zero energy) has a basis in canonical one-to-one correspondence with homotopy classes of maps $f\colon M\to B_\mathcal{G}$, where $B_\mathcal{G}$ is the classifying space of the crossed module $\mathcal{G}$. And in particular $\dim GS(M,L)$ depends only on the topology of M.

Proof. Compare the preceding observation with (15). □

Remark 32. It was proven in [BCK+16] that the dimension of the ground state $GS(M,L)$, coincides with Yetter invariant of $M\times S^1$. In particular it is dependent on the space M, but does not depend on L. We note that the Yetter invariant of M is not quite the same as $\dim GS(M,L)$ since the latter uses finer information on the space of functions $M\to B_\mathcal{G}$ than simply its number of connected components.

Remark 33. We can write $\dim GS(M,L,\mathcal{G})$ as $\dim GS(M,\mathcal{G})$, since it does not depend on the lattice decomposition. Indeed it depends only on the homotopy type of M and the weak homotopy type of the crossed module $\mathcal{G}$ [FMP07], since the homotopy type of the classifying space depends only on the weak homotopy type of the crossed module.

5.3 Higher gauge theory in the 3-sphere

Let $\mathcal{G}=(\partial\colon E\to G,\triangleright)$ be a crossed module. In this subsection we investigate the higher Kitaev model in the 3-sphere by using the lattice decompositions L_0 and $L=L_\mathfrak{g}$ of example 4. This will shed some light at the type of excitations that can arise in general. (We recall that ground states were investigated in §5.2.)

The calculations indicate that the Hilbert spaces of higher lattice gauge theory decompose in what we called 2-flux states, with well defined 2-dimensional holonomy along a closed surface. These 2-flux states orthogonally decompose into edge charges, supported on a string, and the latter states furthermore decompose into vertex charge states.

For 2-fluxes with trivial 2D holonomy, the structure of the edge-charge states is very akin to that of a categorical representation of a crossed module on a Kapranov-Voevodsky 2-vector space [BBFW12, BM06, CY05]. We intend to make this correspondence explicit in a future publication.

5.3.1 Representation theoretical conventions / resume

In this section E and G are finite groups. The category of representations of E in a complex vector space is denoted by $\mathbf{Reps}(E)$. All representations here will be in $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces. Recall that any representation λ of a finite group E in a vector space V is unitarisable, meaning that an inner product in V exists which is invariant under E, namely $\langle\lambda_e(v),\lambda_e(w)\rangle=\langle v,w\rangle$ for each $v,w\in V$ and each $e\in E$. If λ is irreducible then any two such invariant inner products are scalar multiples of each other.

Let $\mathbb{C}[E]$ denote the group algebra of E, itself a representation of E by left multiplication (i.e. $\mathbb{C}[E]$ is the regular representation of E). We give $\mathbb{C}[E]$ the inner product that makes different elements of E orthonormal, making it a complex Euclidean vector space. (Our convention for complex inner products is

$$\langle cv, c'v' \rangle = c\overline{c'}\langle v, v' \rangle,$$

where $v, v' \in V$ and $c, c' \in \mathbb{C}$; the bar denotes complex conjugation.)

Let λ be a unitary representation of E in $V = V^\lambda$, with invariant inner product $\langle , \rangle$. Thus V is a complex Euclidean vector space. Choose a $v_0 \in V^\lambda \setminus \{0\}$. Then the linear map $T^\lambda_{v_0} \colon V \to \mathbb{C}[E]$ such that:

$$v \overset{T^\lambda_{v_0}}{\longmapsto} \sum_{e \in E} \langle \lambda_{e^{-1}} v, v_0 \rangle e \tag{16}$$

is an interwiner in $\mathbf{Reps}(E)(\lambda, \mathbb{C}[E])$.

Map $T^\lambda_{v_0}$ explicitly depends on the chosen invariant inner product in V^λ, however, for irreps, very mildly: $T^\lambda_{v_0}$ is well defined up to real scalar multiples. We recall some elementary (however extraordinarily useful) results about these matrix elements of group representations:

- If λ is irreducible and $v_0 \in V^\lambda$ is non-zero, then $T^\lambda_{v_0} \colon V^\lambda \to \mathbb{C}[E]$ is injective.
- If λ and λ' are inequivalent irreps in V and V', $v_0 \in V$ and $v_0' \in V'$, then: $T^\lambda_{v_0}(V) \perp T^{\lambda'}_{v_0}(V')$.
- If λ is an irrep in V and if $u, v \in V$ are perpendicular then $T^\lambda_v(V) \perp T^\lambda_u(V')$. More generally:

$$\left\langle T^\lambda_v(v'), T^\lambda_u(u') \right\rangle = \frac{\#E}{\dim(V)} \langle u, v \rangle \langle v', u' \rangle, \text{ for each } v, v', u, u' \in V.$$

- Let $\Lambda(E)$ be a set of irreps of E containing exactly one representation for each isomorphism class. For each $\lambda \in \Lambda(E)$ choose an orthogonal basis $\{v^\lambda_1, \ldots, v^\lambda_{\dim(V^\lambda)}\}$ of V^λ. Consider the representation:

$$\Lambda^{\oplus}_E = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda(E)} \bigoplus_{i_\lambda = 1}^{\dim(V_\lambda)} V^\lambda_{i_\lambda},$$

  where $V^\lambda_{i_\lambda} = V^\lambda$ for $i_\lambda = 1, \dim(V^\lambda)$. Then the linear map $T_E \colon \Lambda^{\oplus}_E \to \mathbb{C}[E]$, where

$$T_E = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(E)} \sum_{i_\lambda = 1}^{\dim(V^\lambda)} T^\lambda_{v_{i_\lambda}} \tag{17}$$

  is an isomorphism of representations. (NB: this is just a concrete way to state the well known result that the regular representation of a finite group contains each irrep ρ $\dim(\rho)$ times.)

Definition 5.3 (Total space of a irrep)**.** If λ is an irreducible representation its total space is defined to be:

$$T^\lambda(V) = \sum_{v \in V^\lambda} T^\lambda_v(V) \subset \mathbb{C}[E].$$

(V being the representation space of λ.) Two irreps are equivalent if and only if their total spaces in $\mathbb{C}[E]$ coincide. Note that $\dim(T^\lambda(V)) = \big(\dim(V)\big)^2$. $T^\lambda(V)$ is a subrepresentation of $\mathbb{C}(E)$ which is isotypical.

Given a finite group H we will write κ_H, or just κ, for the trivial representation. Given irreps ρ and λ of G and E, a natural generalisation of the operators A_v and B_t from (13) are the projectors [CR90, §9B]:

$$A^\rho_v = \frac{\dim(\rho)}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} \chi^\rho(g^{-1}) U^g_v, \qquad\qquad B^\lambda_t = \frac{\dim(\lambda)}{\#E} \sum_{e \in E} \chi^\lambda(e^{-1}) U^e_t. \tag{18}$$

Here $\chi^\lambda(-)$ denotes the trace in representation λ, and similarly for ρ. Then $A_v = A^{\kappa_G}_v$ and $B_t = B^{\kappa_E}_t$. Each $\mathcal{T}$-module restricts to a module for its natural subgroup G or E. These operators act like scalars on each

irrep component of such a restriction. If a component belongs to $\mu \in \Lambda(E)$ then the scalar for B_t^λ is zero unless $\mu = \lambda$, and otherwise it is one, and similarly for A_v^ρ .

Let $\mathcal{G} = (\partial\colon E \to G, \triangleright)$ be a crossed module. If $\lambda\colon (e, v) \in E \times V \longmapsto \lambda_e(v) \in V$ is a representation of E on space V then for $g \in G$

$$(g \star_\triangleright \lambda)_e(v) = \lambda_{g^{-1} \triangleright e}(v) \tag{19}$$

gives a new representation $g \star_\triangleright \lambda$ on V. This is a left action of G on the class of representations of E:

$$(gh)\star_\triangleright \lambda \;=\; g\star_\triangleright (h \star_\triangleright \lambda).$$

NB, For the trivial module κ we have $g\star_\triangleright \kappa = \kappa$ for all $g \in G$, and indeed $g\star_\triangleright \lambda = \kappa$ implies $\lambda = \kappa$.

Example 34. Consider the crossed module $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{32} := (\partial : \mathbb{Z}_3^+ \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times, \triangleright)$, of example 1. The complex irreps λ^k $(k \in \mathbb{Z}_3^+)$ of $\mathbb{Z}_3^+$ are $\lambda_e^k = \exp\left(\frac{2e\pi ik}{3}\right)$ for each $e \in \mathbb{Z}_3^+$. Here then,

$$-1\star_\triangleright \lambda^0 = \lambda^0, \qquad -1\star_\triangleright \lambda^1 = \lambda^2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad -1\star_\triangleright \lambda^2 = \lambda^1$$

5.3.2 Warm up: (S^3, L_0)

Now back to the excitations of the higher Kitaev model of Def.5.2. Consider the 3-sphere S^3 with the lattice decomposition L_0, with a unique 0-cell, no 1-cells, one 2-cell (thus the 2-skeleton is S^2) and two blobs, attaching on each side of the 2-sphere; cf. examples 4 and 17. The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0)$ is thus isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}\ker(\partial)$, the vector space generated by the orthonormal basis $\ker(\partial) \subset E$. The 2-dimensional holonomy along the 2-sphere of a gauge configuration associated with $m \in \ker(\partial)$ is m itself: $\mathrm{Hol}_v^2(m) = m$.

For this 2-lattice we have no edge operators. The Hamiltonian $H_{L_0}\colon \mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0) \to \mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0)$ therefore has the form $H_{L_0} = \mathcal{A}_{L_0} + \mathcal{C}_{L_0}$, where:

$$\mathcal{A}_{L_0} m = m - \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{a \in G} (a \triangleright m), \tag{20}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{L_0} m = m - \delta(m, 1_E)\, m. \tag{21}$$

The diagonal decomposition of the Hamiltonian $H_{L_0}\colon \mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0) \to \mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0)$ is quite simple. Given an orbit c of G in $\ker(\partial)$, put $H_c = \mathbb{C}c$, the free vector space in c, with the linearisation of the action of G on c. H_c therefore is a representation of G and the orbit c is the higher-gauge theory analogue of a flux; we call it therefore a "2-flux". States in H_c have a well defined 2D holonomy along S^2.

A vertex internal charge of the 2-flux c is by definition an irreducible representation ρ of G occurring in H_c. The corresponding isotypical representation of G is denoted by $H_{c,\rho}$. Thus $H_{c,\rho}$ is the largest subrepresentation of H_c isomorphic to a power of ρ. We have an orthogonal decomposition:

$$\mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0) = \sum_{\text{orbits } c \text{ of } G \text{ in } \ker(\partial)}^{\perp} \quad \sum_{\substack{\text{vertex internal charges} \\ \rho \text{ of the 2-flux } c}}^{\perp} H_{c,\rho}.$$

And clearly the operators $\mathcal{C}_{L_0}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{L_0}$ restrict to:

$$\mathcal{C}_{L_0|H_{c,\rho}} = \begin{cases} 0, \text{if } c = \{1_E\} \\ \mathrm{id}, \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{A}_{L_0|H_{c,\rho}} = \begin{cases} 0, \text{if } \rho \text{ is the trivial representation of } G \\ \mathrm{id}, \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

5.3.3 $(S^3, L_{\mathfrak{g}})$

Let $\mathcal{G} = (\partial\colon E \to G, \triangleright)$. Give S^3 the decomposition $L = L_{\mathfrak{g}} = (\{v\}, \{t\}, \{p, p'\}, \{b, b'\})$ of example 4. We have:

$$\mathcal{H}(S^3, L) \;=\; \mathbb{C}\{(g, e, f) \in G \times E \times E \,:\, \partial(e) = g \text{ and } \partial(f) = g\}.$$

The 2-dimensional holonomy of a configuration $\mathcal{F} = (g, e, f)$ along the 2-sphere $S^2 \subset S^3$, based at v, is:

$$\mathrm{Hol}_v^2(g, e, f) = e^{-1} f.$$

Cf. §5.1, the vertex and edge gauge spikes on v and t and the blob operators along b and b' have the form:

$$U_v^a(g,e,f) = \big(aga^{-1}, a \triangleright e, a \triangleright f\big), \tag{22}$$

$$U_t^k(g,e,f) = (\partial(k)g, ke, kf), \tag{23}$$

$$C_b^{k'}(g,e,f) = \delta(k', e^{-1}f)(g,e,f), \tag{24}$$

$$C_{b'}^{k'}(g,e,f) = \delta(k', e^{-1}f)(g,e,f). \tag{25}$$

(Here $a, b, g \in G$, $k, e, f, k' \in E$.) The commutation relations of lemmas 26, 27 and 28 here boil down to:

$$\begin{aligned}
U_v^a U_v^{a'} &= U_v^{aa'}, \quad a, a' \in G, \\
U_t^k U_t^l &= U_t^{kl}, \quad k, l \in E, \\
U_t^k U_v^a &= U_v^a U_t^{a^{-1} \triangleright e}, \quad k \in E,\ a \in G. \\
C_b^k U_v^a &= U_v^a C_b^{a^{-1} \triangleright k}, \quad k \in E,\ a \in G, \\
C_b^k U_t^l &= U_t^l C_b^k, \quad k, l \in E.
\end{aligned}$$

The Hamiltonian $H\colon \mathcal{H}(S^3, L) \to \mathcal{H}(S^3, L)$ has the form $H = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C}$, where:

$$\mathcal{A}(g,e,f) = (g,e,f) - \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{a \in G} (aga^{-1}, a \triangleright e, a \triangleright f), \tag{26}$$

$$\mathcal{B}(g,e,f) = (g,e,f) - \frac{1}{\#E} \sum_{k \in E} (\partial(k)g, ke, kf), \tag{27}$$

$$\mathcal{C}(g,e,f) = (g,e,f) - \delta(e^{-1}f, 1_E)\,(g,e,f). \tag{28}$$

In 5.3.4 and 5.3.5 we diagonalise the action of these three mutually commuting self-adjoint projectors. On the contrary of the (S^3, L_0) example we will now have edge charges associated to the equator of S^2.

Remark 35. As expected, the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0)$ and $\mathcal{H}(S^3, L)$ are closely related. We have a projection map $\mu\colon \mathcal{H}(S^3, L) \to \mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0)$, where $\mu(e,f) = e^{-1}f$. Its hermitian adjoint is:

$$\mu^*(m) = \sum_{e^{-1}f = m} (\partial(e), e, f)$$

where $m \in \ker(\partial)$. Clearly vertex and blob operators in $\mathcal{H}(S^3, L)$ and in $\mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0)$ commute with μ and μ^*. Also $\mu \circ \mathcal{B}(g,e,f) = 0$ and $\mathcal{B}(g,e,f) \circ \mu^* = 0$. Consequentely $\mu \circ H_L = H_{L_0} \circ \mu$. Thus if we put $H_L \circ \mu^* = \mu^* \circ H_{L_0}$ then $\mathcal{H}(S^3, L) = \ker(\mu) + \ker(\mu)^\perp$ and H_L preserves this orthogonal decomposition. Also note that $\mu^* \circ \mu = \#(E)\mathrm{id}$. Thus the orthogonal projection $\mathcal{H}(S^3, L) \to \ker(\mu)^\perp$ is $\frac{1}{\#E}\mu^*\mu$.

Conjecture: Similar relations hold for any manifold M and for any pair of lattice decompositions of M, if one is finer that the other. An inverse-limit Hilbert space and inverse-limit Hamiltonian can be functorially assigned to any piecewise-linear manifold as in [Yet93].

5.3.4 2-fluxes and edge charges for (S^3, L)

Fix $\mathcal{G} = (\partial\colon E \to G, \triangleright)$. Define

$$E \hat{\times} E = \{(e,f) \in E \times E :\ \partial(e) = \partial(f)\}.$$

Note the natural identification $E \hat{\times} E = \Phi(S^3, L, \mathcal{G})$ given by $(e,f) \mapsto (\partial(e), e, f)$. Then $\mathcal{H}(S^3, L) = \mathbb{C}E \hat{\times} E$, with an inner product that makes elements of $E \hat{\times} E$ pairwise orthogonal.

By the identification the action of $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(S^3, L, \mathcal{G}) = E \rtimes_\bullet G$ on $\Phi(S^3, L, \mathcal{G})$ (cf. §4.4) becomes an action of $\mathcal{T}$ on $E \hat{\times} E$ which is

$$(a,g) * (e,f) = \big(a\, g \triangleright e, a\, g \triangleright f\big). \tag{29}$$

Recall from remark 35 that we have a map $\mu\colon E \hat{\times} E \to \ker(\partial) \subset E$ defined as $\mu(e,f) = e^{-1}f$. μ is equivariant under the action of $\mathcal{T}$ in the sense that $\mu\big((a,g) * (e,f)\big) = g \triangleright \mu(f)$.

For $S \subseteq E$ define $E \hat{\times}_S E = \mu^{-1}(S)$. The set of orbits of the G action by $\triangleright$ in $\ker(\partial) \subset E$ (i.e. the set of 2-fluxes 5.3.2) is denoted by $\mathcal{O}_\triangleright$. And by construction:

Lemma 36. The decomposition below is a partition of $E\hat{\times}E$ into $\mathcal{T}$ orbits:

$$E\hat{\times}E \;=\; \sqcup_{c\in\mathcal{O}_\triangleright}\; E\hat{\times}_c E.$$

That is, elements (e,f) and (e',f') in $E\hat{\times}E$ are in the same $\mathcal{T}$ orbit if and only if $\mu(e,f)$ is in $G\triangleright\mu(e',f')$.

Proof. The orbit $\mathcal{T}(e,f)$ contains $(e^{-1}e, e^{-1}f) = (1_E, e^{-1}f)$. Note $e^{-1}f\in\ker(\partial)\subset E$. Within the subset of elements of $\mathcal{T}(e,f)$ of form $(1,d)$ (d in $\ker(\partial)$) there are only the elements of form $(1_E,g)(1_E,e^{-1}f)$. Thus for each orbit we obtain a representative element by choosing a representative of the orbit of $e^{-1}f$ under the action of G on $\ker(\partial)$. □

Put $H\hat{\times}_c H = \mathbb{C}E\hat{\times}_c E$. We have a decomposition in orthogonal components, each called a 2-flux state:

$$\mathcal{H}(S^3,L) = \sum_{c\in\mathcal{O}_\triangleright}^{\perp} H\hat{\times}_c H.$$

For each orbit c of G in $\ker(E)$ we have, from Lem.36 and (28):

$$\mathcal{A}(H\hat{\times}_c H)\subset H\hat{\times}_c H, \qquad \mathcal{B}(H\hat{\times}_c H)\subset H\hat{\times}_c H, \qquad \mathcal{C}(H\hat{\times}_c H)\subset H\hat{\times}_c H.$$

Note $\mathcal{C}\colon H\hat{\times}_c H\to H\hat{\times}_c H$ is the identity if $c=\{1_E\}$ and zero otherwise, so this action is already diagonal.

Now let us further decompose each $H\hat{\times}_c H$. For each 2-flux c in $\mathcal{O}_\triangleright$ choose an element k in c. We have that $\mathcal{T}(1,k) = E\hat{\times}_c E$. That is

$$E\hat{\times}_c E = \{(e, e\,g\triangleright k)\colon g\in G, e\in E\}. \tag{30}$$

In particular for each fixed g we have a subset $\{(e,e\,g\triangleright k)\colon e\in E\}$. This is, for the natural action of $E\subset\mathcal{T}$, a copy of the regular module.

Varying g, these subsets are not all distinct. Consider the left cosets $[h]=hG_k$ of the stabiliser subgroup $G_k = Stab_G(k)$ in G. Evidently every $g\in[h]$ gives the same subset; and g,g' in different cosets give disjoint such subsets. Pick a 'transversal' subset $G_c^\perp$ in G such that $G=\sqcup_{g\in G_c^\perp}[g]$. Then the map from $G_c^\perp\times E$ to $E\hat{\times}_c E$ given by $(g,e)\mapsto(e,e\,g\triangleright k)$ is a bijection. We thus also have a one-to-one map

$$(e,[g])\in E\times[G:Stab_G(k)]\mapsto \big(e,e\;g\triangleright k\big)\in H\hat{\times}_c H. \tag{31}$$

From this point of view, the actions of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ in each $H\hat{\times}_c H$ have the form:

$$\mathcal{A}(e,[g]) = (e,[g]) - \frac{1}{\#G}\sum_{a\in G}\big(a\triangleright e,[ag]\big), \qquad \mathcal{B}(e,[g]) = (e,[g]) - \frac{1}{\#E}\sum_{l\in E}\big(le,[g]\big).$$

Definition 5.4 (Edge charges and pure edge charges supported on a 2-flux: ad-hoc definition)**.** Fix a crossed module $\mathcal{G}$. Fix also a 2-flux $c\in\mathcal{O}_\triangleright$. An edge charge supported in c is given by a pair (k,λ), where:

1. $k\in c$ is an orbit representative.
2. λ is an irreducible representation of E.

An edge charge is called a *pure edge charge* if it is supported in the trivial orbit $\{1_E\}$.

Definition 5.5 (Equivalent edge charges)**.** Two edge charges (k,λ) and (k',λ') supported in the same orbit $c\in\mathcal{O}_\triangleright$ are said to be *equivalent* if there exists an $a\in G$ such that $a{\star_\triangleright}\lambda\cong\lambda'$ and $a\triangleright k = k'$.

Remark: Above $\cong$ denotes isomorphism of representations. Representation $a{\star_\triangleright}\lambda$ is defined in (19).

It can easily be seen that:

Lemma 37. Let $c\in\mathcal{O}_\triangleright$ be a 2-flux. Edge charges (k,λ) and (k',λ') supported in c are equivalent if, and only if, for any $k''\in c$ the following sets of irreps coincide, after passing to representations up to isomorphism:

$$\{a{\star_\triangleright}\lambda\Big|\;\; a\in G \text{ is such that } a\triangleright k = k''\} \text{ and } \{b{\star_\triangleright}\lambda'\Big|\;\; b\in G \text{ is such that } b\triangleright k' = k''\}.$$

Example 38 (Trivial edge charge)**.** The action of G on the class of representations of E is non-trivial; remark 1. However if κ_E is the trivial representation of E, then $g{\star_\triangleright}\kappa_E\cong\kappa_E$ for each $g\in G$. Thus $(k,\kappa_E)\cong(k',\kappa_E)$ for each $k,k'\in c$. This is called the trivial edge charge supported in c.

Let (k,λ) be an edge charge supported in the 2-flux $c \in \mathcal{O}_\triangleright$. Assume we have fixed the E-invariant inner product $\langle , \rangle$ on V^λ once and for all. For fixed $v, w \in V^\lambda$ and $g \in G$ consider an element in $H \times_c H$ of the form

$$h^{v,w}_{g,c,\lambda} \;=\; \sum_{e\in E} \Big\langle (g\star_\triangleright\lambda)_{e^{-1}}(v), w \Big\rangle \, (e, eg \triangleright k) \;=\; \sum_{e\in E} \Big\langle \lambda_{\left(g^{-1}\triangleright e^{-1}\right)}(v), w \Big\rangle \, (e, eg\triangleright k). \tag{32}$$

Cf. (16) we have that, varying v over a basis of V^λ, this gives a basis $h^{*,w}_{g,c,\lambda}$ for a subspace that is invariant under the natural $E \subset \mathcal{T}$, and is isomorphic to $g\star_\triangleright\lambda$. This holds for each w, and varying w over a basis these elements collectively give (by §5.3.1) a basis for what the E-action sees as the whole $g\star_\triangleright\lambda$-isotypic part in a copy of $\mathbb{C}E$ in $H\hat{\times}_c H$. Finally varying over g and λ these elements span $H\hat{\times}_c H$ by (17) and (30). In particular

$$\mathcal{B}\; h^{v,w}_{g,c,\lambda} \;=\; (1-\delta_{\kappa_E, g\star_\triangleright\lambda})\; h^{v,w}_{g,c,\lambda} \;=\; (1-\delta_{\kappa_E,\lambda})\; h^{v,w}_{g,c,\lambda} \tag{33}$$

In (32) the g in $eg\triangleright k$ is there to ensure that, *varying* g, such elements span $H\hat{\times}_c H$; but the g in $g\star_\triangleright\lambda$ is not needed for (33) to hold. The reason for its presence is to do with the action of $G \subset \mathcal{T}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} U^a_v h^{v,w}_{g,c,\lambda} = U^a_v \Big(\sum_{e\in E} \big\langle \lambda_{\left(g^{-1}\triangleright e^{-1}\right)}(v), w\big\rangle \, (e, eg\triangleright k)\Big) = \sum_{e\in E} \big\langle \lambda_{\left(g^{-1}\triangleright e^{-1}\right)}(v), w\big\rangle \, (a\triangleright e, (a\triangleright e)\; ((ag)\triangleright k)) \\ = \sum_{e\in E} \big\langle \lambda_{\left((g^{-1}a^{-1})\triangleright e^{-1}\right)}(v), w\big\rangle \, (e, e\; (ag)\triangleright k) = \sum_{e\in E} \big\langle \lambda_{\left(((ag)^{-1})\triangleright e^{-1}\right)}(v), w\big\rangle \, (e, e\; (ag)\triangleright k) = \; h^{v,w}_{ag,c,\lambda}. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

This tells us that $h^{v,w}_{G,c,\lambda}$ spans a G-module. Note that by (33) $\mathcal{B}$ acts uniformly (as 0 or 1) on it, depending on whether λ is trivial or not. Thus $\mathcal{B}$ will also act uniformly on each of the G-irreducible components.

Given an edge charge (k,λ) supported in c, the associated edge-charge state is the following subspace of $H \times_c H$:

$$\begin{aligned} H \underset{(c,k,\lambda)}{\times} H \;&= \operatorname{span}\Big\{ h^{v,w}_{g,c,\lambda} \;\Big|\; g\in G; v,w \in V^\lambda \Big\} \\ &= \overset{\perp}{\sum_{k'\in c}} \sum_{a\in G\,:\; a\triangleright k = k'} T(V^{a\triangleright\lambda}) \times \{k'\} \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the notation of (31) and Def. 5.3. By construction:

Lemma 39. Let $c \in \mathcal{O}_\triangleright$ be a 2-flux. The following holds:

- If (k,λ) and (k',λ') are equivalent edge charges supported in c then $H \underset{(c,k,\lambda)}{\times} H = H \underset{(c,k',\lambda')}{\times} H$.
- If (c,k,λ) and (c,k',λ') are not equivalent then $\big(H \underset{(c,k,\lambda)}{\times} H\big) \perp \big(H \underset{(c,k',\lambda')}{\times} H\big)$.
- We have the following orthogonal decomposition for the 2-flux Hilbert space:

$$H \times_c H = \overset{\perp}{\sum_{\text{representatives } (k,\lambda)}} H \underset{(c,k,\lambda)}{\times} H,$$

  where the sum is taken over equivalence classes of representatives of edge charges supported in c, recall $(k,\lambda) \cong (k',\lambda')$ if, and only if there exists $g \in G$ such that $g\triangleright k = k'$ and $g\star_\triangleright\lambda \cong \lambda'$.

Lemma 40. Let $c \in \mathcal{O}_\triangleright$. Let (k,λ) be an edge charge supported in c. We have:

$$\mathcal{A}\Big(H \underset{(c,k,\lambda)}{\times} H\Big) \subseteq H \underset{(c,k,\lambda)}{\times} H \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{B}\Big(H \underset{(c,k,\lambda)}{\times} H\Big) \subseteq H \underset{(c,k,\lambda)}{\times} H.$$

Proof. This follows from (34) and (32). □

Lemma 41. For the trivial edge charge state of example 38 we have $\mathcal{B}\Big(H \underset{(c,k,\kappa_E)}{\times} H\Big) = 0$.

If λ is not isomorphic to κ_E then (where the vertical bar denotes restriction) $\mathcal{B}_{\big|\left(H \underset{(c,k,\lambda)}{\times} H\right)} = \mathrm{id}$.

Proof. This follows from the construction and orthogonality theorems (see e.g. [CR90, §9]); see 5.3.1. □

5.3.5 Vertex internal charges and the total diagonalisation of the (S^3, L) Hamiltonian

Now only the action of $\mathcal{A}$ restricted to each edge charge state $H \times_{(c,k,\lambda)} H$ remains to be given. C.f. (34).

Definition 5.6 (Vertex internal charge of an edge charge: ad hoc definition)**.** Let (k, λ) be an edge charge supported on the 2-flux $c \in \mathcal{O}_\triangleright$. A *vertex internal charge* of (c, k, λ) is an irreducible representation ρ of G occurring in $H \times_{(c,k,\lambda)} H$. The corresponding subrepresentation of $H \times_{(c,k,\lambda)} H$ is denoted by: $H \times_{(c,k,\lambda,\rho)} H$.

Thus

$$H \underset{(c,k,\lambda)}{\times} H = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \{\rho_1, ...\}} H \underset{(c,k,\lambda,\rho)}{\times} H$$

is a decomposition of $H \times_{(c,k,\lambda)} H$ regarded as a $\mathbb{C}G$-module. Here the details of the set $\{\rho_1, ...\}$ (which may include different irreps and multiple copies of irreps up to isomorphism) need not concern us.

We have achieved the total diagonalisation of the Hamiltonian for lattice higher gauge theory over (S^3, L).

$$\mathcal{H}(S^3, L) = \sum_{\text{orbits } c \text{ of } G \text{ in } \ker(\partial)}^{\perp} \quad \sum_{\substack{\text{equivalence classes of edge} \\ \text{charges } (k,\lambda) \text{ supported in } c}}^{\perp} \quad \sum_{\substack{\text{vertex internal charges} \\ \rho \text{ of } (c,k,\lambda)}}^{\perp} H \underset{(c,k,\lambda,\rho)}{\times} H.$$

In summary:

$$\mathcal{C}_{|H \underset{(c,k,\lambda,\rho)}{\times} H} = \begin{cases} 0, \text{if } c = \{1_E\} \\ \text{id, otherwise} \end{cases} \quad , \quad \mathcal{B}_{|H \underset{(c,k,\lambda,\rho)}{\times} H} = \begin{cases} 0, \text{if } \lambda \cong \kappa_E \\ \text{id, otherwise} \end{cases} \quad , \quad \mathcal{A}_{|H \underset{(c,k,\lambda,\rho)}{\times} H} = \begin{cases} 0, \text{if } \rho \cong \kappa_G \\ \text{id, otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

Remark 42. Edge charges are associated with failure of higher gauge invariance along the equator. Inside each edge charge, a vertex internal charge measures the failure of gauge invariance along the single vertex.

Remark 43. Continuing the example (S^3, L_0) of 5.3.2. Cf. equation (32), applying $\mu \colon \mathcal{H}(S^3, L) \to \mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0)$ to $h^{v,w}_{g,c,\lambda}$ yields

$$\mu(h^{v,w}_{g,c,\lambda}) \quad = \quad \sum_{e \in E} \left\langle \lambda_{\left(g^{-1} \triangleright e^{-1}\right)}(v), w \right\rangle \mu((e, eg \triangleright k)) = \sum_{e \in E} \langle \lambda_{\left(g^{-1} \triangleright e^{-1}\right)}(v), w \rangle \, (g \triangleright k)$$

which is zero unless λ is trivial. Thus $\mu \colon \mathcal{H}(S^3, L) \to \mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0)$ kills off all edge-charge states associated with a non-trivial representations of E, and only these. Morever μ defines an isometry:

$$\ker(\mu) = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{O}_\triangleright}^{\perp} \quad \sum_{\substack{\text{equivalence classes of edge} \\ \text{charges } (k,\kappa_E) \text{ supported in } c}}^{\perp} \quad \sum_{\substack{\text{vertex internal charges} \\ \rho \text{ of } (c,k,\kappa_E)}}^{\perp} H \underset{(c,k,\kappa_E,\rho)}{\times} H \xrightarrow{\mu} \mathcal{H}(S^3, L_0),$$

restricting to an isometry $H \underset{(c,k,\kappa_E,\rho)}{\times} H \to H_{c,\rho}$.

5.3.6 An explicit example

Consider the crossed module $\mathcal{G} = (\partial : \mathbb{Z}_3^+ \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times, \triangleright)$ from Example 1. Note that there are two $\star_\triangleright$-orbits of $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times$, namely the trivial one $B = \{0\}$ and $F = \{1, 2\}$.

In this case the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}(S^3, L)$ is 9 dimensional. Edge charges come in two lots: we have the pure edge charges which are triples $(B, 0, \lambda^k)$ where $k = 0, 1, 2$ and $(B, 0, \lambda^k) \cong (B, 0, \lambda^{k'})$ if $k = \pm k'$. And the remaining edge charges which are triples (F, e, λ^k) where $k = 0, 1, 2$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}_3 \setminus \{0\}$, and $(B, e, \lambda^k) \cong$

$(B, e', \lambda^{k'})$ if $(e,k) = \pm(e',k')$. The decomposition of $\mathcal{H}(S^3, L)$ in edge charges is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}(S^3, L) &= \operatorname{span}(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) = \operatorname{span}\{(e,f) \colon e, f \in \mathbb{Z}_3\} \\ &= \operatorname{span}\left\{ \sum_{a\in\mathbb{Z}_3} \exp\left(\frac{2a\pi ik}{3}\right)(a,a) \,\middle|\, k = 0 \right\} \\ &\quad \overset{\perp}{\bigoplus} \operatorname{span}\left\{ \sum_{a\in\mathbb{Z}_3} \exp\left(\frac{2a\pi ik}{3}\right)(a,a) \,\middle|\, k = 1,2 \right\} \\ &\quad \overset{\perp}{\bigoplus} \left\{ \sum_{a\in\mathbb{Z}_3} \exp\left(\frac{2a\pi ik}{3}\right)(a,a+e) \,\middle|\, k = 0, e = 1,2 \right\} \\ &\quad \overset{\perp}{\bigoplus} \operatorname{span}\left\{ \sum_{a\in\mathbb{Z}_3} \exp\left(\frac{2a\pi ik}{3}\right)(a,a+k) \,\middle|\, k = 1,2 \right\} \\ &\quad \overset{\perp}{\bigoplus} \operatorname{span}\left\{ \sum_{a\in\mathbb{Z}_3} \exp\left(\frac{2a\pi ik}{3}\right)(a,a+k+1) \,\middle|\, k = 1,2 \right\}\end{aligned}$$

It is a nice exercise to check that all of the spaces above indeed are invariant under the action of $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ and $\mathbb{Z}_3^+$ in $\mathcal{H}(S^3)$, namely $z*(e,f) = (ze, zf)$ and $a*(e,f) = (ae, ef)$, where $a \in \mathbb{Z}_3^+$ and $z \in \{\pm 1\}$. This diagonalises the Hamiltonian with respect to the action of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.

Now each of the spaces has itself an action of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ which decomposes into irreducibles. Let us look at the second component. Let

$$\begin{aligned}|1> &= (0,0) + \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{3}\right)(1,1) + \exp\left(\frac{4\pi i}{3}\right)(2,2) \\ |2> &= (0,0) + \exp\left(\frac{4\pi i}{3}\right)(1,1) + \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{3}\right)(2,2)\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\operatorname{span}\left\{ \sum_{a\in\mathbb{Z}_3} \exp\left(\frac{2a\pi ik}{3}\right)(a,a) \,\middle|\, k = 1,2 \right\} = \operatorname{span}\{|1>, |2>\}.$$

The blob operator $\mathcal{C}$ acts as 0. The edge operator $\mathcal{B}$ acts as the identity. And the vertex operator $\mathcal{A}$ has two eigenvectors $|1> + |2>$ and $|1> - |2>$ with energy 0 and 1, respectively.

References

[Bae96] J. C. Baez. Four-dimensional bf theory as a topological quantum field theory. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 38(2):129–143, 1996.

[Bae00] John C. Baez. An introduction to spin foam models of BF theory and quantum gravity. In *Geometry and quantum physics (Schladming, 1999)*, volume 543 of *Lecture Notes in Phys.*, pages 25–93. Springer, Berlin, 2000.

[BBFW12] John C. Baez, Aristide Baratin, Laurent Freidel, and Derek K. Wise. Infinite-dimensional representations of 2-groups. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 219(1032):vi+120, 2012.

[BCK+16] Alex Bullivant, Marcos Calçada, Kádár, Paul Martin, and Faria Martins, João. Topological phases from higher gauge symmetry in 3+1d. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06639*, 2016.

[BF15] Aristide Baratin and Laurent Freidel. A 2-categorical state sum model. *J. Math. Phys.*, 56(1):011705, 18, 2015.

[BH81a] Ronald Brown and Philip J. Higgins. Colimit theorems for relative homotopy groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 22:11–41, 1981.

[BH81b] Ronald Brown and Philip J. Higgins. On the algebra of cubes. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 21:233–260, 1981.

[BH91] Ronald Brown and Philip J. Higgins. The classifying space of a crossed complex. *Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.*, 110(1):95–120, 1991.

[BH11] John C Baez and John Huerta. An invitation to higher gauge theory. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 43(9):2335–2392, 2011.

[BHS11] Ronald Brown, Philip J. Higgins, and Rafael Sivera. *Nonabelian algebraic topology. Filtered spaces, crossed complexes, cubical homotopy groupoids. With contributions by Christopher D. Wensley and Sergei V. Soloviev.* Zürich: European Mathematical Society (EMS), 2011.

[BL04] John C. Baez and Aaron D. Lauda. Higher-dimensional algebra. V: 2-Groups. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 12:423–491, 2004.

[BM06] John W. Barrett and Marco Mackaay. Categorical representations of categorical groups. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 16:529–557, 2006.

[Bro99] Ronald Brown. Groupoids and crossed objects in algebraic topology. *Homology Homotopy Appl.*, 1:1–78, 1999.

[Bro06] Ronald Brown. *Topology and groupoids. 3rd revised, updated and extended ed.* Bangor: Ronald Brown, 3rd revised, updated and extended ed. edition, 2006.

[BS07] John C. Baez and Urs Schreiber. Higher gauge theory. In *Categories in algebra, geometry and mathematical physics. Conference and workshop in honor of Ross Street's 60th birthday, Sydney and Canberra, Australia, July 11–16/July 18–21, 2005*, pages 7–30. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2007.

[BW96] John Barrett and Bruce Westbury. Invariants of piecewise-linear 3-manifolds. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 348(10):3997–4022, 1996.

[CF12] Richard H Crowell and Ralph Hartzler Fox. *Introduction to knot theory*, volume 57. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[CR90] Charles W Curtis and Irving Reiner. *Methods of Representation Theory: With Applications to Finite Groups and Orders. Vol. I.* Wiley-Interscience, 1990.

[Cui16] Shawn X Cui. Higher categories and topological quantum field theories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.07628*, 2016.

[CY93] Louis Crane and David Yetter. A categorical construction of 4D topological quantum field theories. In *Quantum topology*, volume 3 of *Ser. Knots Everything*, pages 120–130. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1993.

[CY05] Louis Crane and David N. Yetter. Measurable categories and 2-groups. *Appl. Categ. Structures*, 13(5-6):501–516, 2005.

[DW90] Robbert Dijkgraaf and Edward Witten. Topological gauge theories and group cohomology. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 129(2):393–429, 1990.

[Elg07] Josep Elgueta. Representation theory of 2-groups on kapranov and voevodsky's 2-vector spaces. *Advances in Mathematics*, 213(1):53 – 92, 2007.

[Far07] João Faria Martins. On the homotopy type and the fundamental crossed complex of the skeletal filtration of a CW-complex. *Homology Homotopy Appl.*, 9(1):295–329, 2007.

[Far09] João Faria Martins. The fundamental crossed module of the complement of a knotted surface. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 361(9):4593–4630, 2009.

[FMM11] João Faria Martins and Aleksandar Miković. Lie crossed modules and gauge-invariant actions for 2-BF theories. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 15(4):1059–1084, 2011.

[FMP07] João Faria Martins and Timothy Porter. On yetter's invariant and an extension of the dijkgraaf–witten invariant to categorical groups. *Theory Appl. Categ*, 18(4):118–150, 2007.

[FP90] Rudolf Fritsch and Renzo A. Piccinini. *Cellular structures in topology.* Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

[FP11] João Faria Martins and Roger Picken. Surface holonomy for non-Abelian 2-bundles via double groupoids. *Adv. Math.*, 226(4):3309–3366, 2011.

[Fra91] Eduardo Fradkin. *Field theories of condensed matter systems*, volume 7. Addison-Wesley Redwood City, 1991.

[GPP08] F. Girelli, H. Pfeiffer, and E. M. Popescu. Topological higher gauge theory: from BF to $BFCG$ theory. *J. Math. Phys.*, 49(3):032503, 17, 2008.

[Hat02] Allen Hatcher. *Algebraic topology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[HIZ05] A. Hamma, R. Ionicioiu, and P. Zanardi. Bipartite entanglement and entropic boundary law in lattice spin systems. *Phys. Rev. A*, 71:022315, Feb 2005.

[HWW13] Yuting Hu, Yidun Wan, and Yong-Shi Wu. Twisted quantum double model of topological phases in two dimensions. *Physical Review B*, 87(12):125114, 2013.

[Kap14] Anton Kapustin. Ground-state degeneracy for abelian anyons in the presence of gapped boundaries. *Physical Review B*, 89(12):125307, 2014.

[Kit03] A Yu Kitaev. Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons. *Annals of Physics*, 303(1):2–30, 2003.

[KMRW16] Zoltan Kadar, Paul Martin, Eric Rowell, and Zhenghan Wang. Local representations of the loop braid group. *Glasgow Mathematical Journal*, pages 1–20, 2016.

[Kog79] John B Kogut. An introduction to lattice gauge theory and spin systems. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 51(4):659, 1979.

[KP06] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill. Topological entanglement entropy. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 96:110404, 2006.

[KW14] Liang Kong and Xiao-Gang Wen. Braided fusion categories, gravitational anomalies, and the mathematical framework for topological orders in any dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1405.5858*, 2014.

[LW69] A.T. Lundell and S. Weingram. The topology of CW complexes. The University Series in Higher Mathematics. New York etc.: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company. VIII, 216 p. (1969)., 1969.

[LW05] M. A Levin and X.-G. Wen. String-net condensation: A physical mechanism for topological phases. *Phys. Rev. B*, 71(4):045110, 2005.

[LW06] M. Levin and X.-G. Wen. Detecting topological order in a ground state wave function. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 96:110405, 2006.

[Mac98] S.M. MacLane. *Categories for the Working Mathematician.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 1998.

[Mar91] P Martin. *Potts models and related problems in statistical mechanics.* World Scientific, 1991.

[NSS+08] Chetan Nayak, Steven H. Simon, Ady Stern, Michael Freedman, and Sankar Das Sarma. Non-abelian anyons and topological quantum computation. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 80:1083–1159, Sep 2008.

[Oec05] Robert Oeckl. *Discrete gauge theory: From lattices to TQFT.* World Scientific, 2005.

[Pac12] Jiannis K Pachos. *Introduction to topological quantum computation.* Cambridge University Press, 2012.

[Pfe03] Hendryk Pfeiffer. Higher gauge theory and a non-abelian generalization of 2-form electrodynamics. *Annals of Physics*, 308(2):447–477, 2003.

[Por99] Tim Porter. Topological quantum field theories from homotopy n-types. *J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser.*, 58(3):723–732, 1999.

[PT05] T Porter and V Turaev. Formal homotopy quantum field theories i: Formal maps and crossed c-algebras. *arxiv:0512032*, 2005.

[SW11] Urs Schreiber and Konrad Waldorf. Smooth functors vs. differential forms. *Homology Homotopy Appl.*, 13(1):143–203, 2011.

[SW13] Urs Schreiber and Konrad Waldorf. Connections on non-abelian gerbes and their holonomy. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 28:476–540, 2013.

[Tur94] V. G. Turaev. *Quantum invariants of knots and 3-manifolds*, volume 18. Walter de Gruyter, 1994.

[vKS13] C. W. von Keyserlingk, F. J. Burnell and S. H. Simon. Three-dimensional topological lattice models with surface anyons. *Phys. Rev. B*, 87:045107, 2013.

[Wan10] Z. Wang. *Topological quantum computation*. Number 112. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.

[Wil74] K G Wilson. Confinement of quarks. *Phys Rev*, 10:2445, 1974.

[Wit89] Edward Witten. Quantum field theory and the jones polynomial. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 121(3):351–399, 1989.

[WN90] Xiao-Gang Wen and Qian Niu. Ground-state degeneracy of the fractional quantum hall states in the presence of a random potential and on high-genus riemann surfaces. *Physical Review B*, 41(13):9377, 1990.

[WW12] K. Walker and Z. Wang. (3+ 1)-tqfts and topological insulators. *Front. Phys.*, 7(2):150–159, 2012.

[WW16] Dominic J Williamson and Zhenghan Wang. Hamiltonian realizations of (3+ 1)-tqfts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.07144*, 2016.

[WWH15] Yidun Wan, Juven C Wang, and Huan He. Twisted gauge theory model of topological phases in three dimensions. *Physical Review B*, 92(4):045101, 2015.

[Yet93] David N Yetter. Tqfts from homotopy 2-types. *Journal of Knot Theory and its Ramifications*, 2(01):113–123, 1993.